This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

47. 1359.

THE

CHURCHES OF ENGLAND AND ROME

BRIEFLY TESTED

BY THE NICENE CREED,

AS APPLIED BY MR. NORTHCOTE.

BY A

MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

LONDON:.
J. MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET.
BATH: W. POCOCK.

1847.

ERRATA.

Page 4, line 16, for *whole*, read *the whole*.
10, last note, for § *Concil* read || *Concil*.
.... || *Ad Evagr*, read § *Ad Evagr*.
17, line 31, for *question*, read *questions*.
19, lines 15 & 32, for *Basil*, read *Basel*.
27, line 16, for , *exactly*. read . *Exactly*,
28, line 20, for *New Cross*, read *new cross*.
29, line 29, for *Pontificial*, read *Pontifical*.
34, line 25, leave out comma after *her*.
53, line 10, put in a comma after *do*.
54, bottom, for *Enseb*, read *Euseb*.
72, note, for 177,214, read 177-214.
75, line 3, for *endevours*, read *endeavours*.
76, line 16, for *reserved*, read *reversed*.
84, references at the bottom, for *s*, read §
89, line 13, for *sacrifice ;"* read *sacrifice ;*
89, line 27, for *denied*, read *denied."*
103, line 3, for *probably*, read *probable*.
105, line 9, for *vow."* read *vow*.
105, line 9, for *hac*, read *hæc*.
105, line 13, for *Holmann*, read *Holymann*.
105, line 18, for *castitatem,"* read *castitatem.'"*
120, line 15, for *three*, read *their*.
121, line 5, for *exonoration*, read *exoneration*.
126, line 4, for *but*, read *best*.
136, line 4, for *Hooker,"* read *Hooker*.
136, line 8, for *are,"* read *are.'"*
142, line 14, for *thing*, read *things*.
142, line 31, for *Langfranc*, read *Lanfranc*.
146, line 8, for *prove*, read *proves*.
147, line 13, for *her*, read *it's*.
173, line 26, leave out *most*.
180, line 21, for *glorify*, read *glorify."*

PREFACE.

SOME apology seems required for the late appearance of the following pages—they were in fact announced at the beginning of the present year, as shortly to be published; but circumstances have unavoidably delayed the publication. Originally mere marginal notes to the pamphlet published by Mr. Northcote, it was intended to put them forth in a very brief form last year. In the meantime however Mr. Gresley's letters appeared, and the intention was suspended, but again renewed, as Mr. Gresley's letters did not touch upon many points of detail. It was expected that these observations would have been very brief, and ready for the public in three or four weeks, therefore they were announced as shortly to appear. It soon however became evident that, in order to carry out the intention of them, the observations must go much more into detail, and be extended to a much greater length than was originally intended. Since that time many other urgent duties and private cares have intervened, and these, together with many delays on the part of the publisher, have caused the delay to be so very great. It may seem absurd to send out an answer to a mere pamphlet such as Mr. Northcote's, so long after its first appearance, and when very

probably its appearance has been forgotten; and had it been possible so to do, this would have been altered, and published as having no immediate reference to the pamphlet in question. But it is so mixed up with that pamphlet, that any such alteration would be impossible, without re-writing the whole. It must therefore appear as it is with this explanation and apology.

It is a difficult thing to write briefly on great matters, and I have found myself engaged in no easy task in compressing, what I wished to say, even into its present compass. Moreover to answer requires more words than to write. There are so many assertions made by Mr. Northcote in a few lines, which require some pages to disprove them; and the style which he has adopted makes this be unusually needful. I trust that I have not written anything needlessly uncharitable, and I must acknowledge that I have seldom if ever seen a more kind and loving mode of controversial writing than Mr. Northcote's. Yet this very charity has produced evil: it has betrayed him into a loose style of writing; caused him to express himself vaguely; and rendered his conclusions very illogical, and his statements incorrect. I fear I cannot discharge him of great want of care; his historical inaccuracies, and his misquotations and misrepresentations are very frequent and very grievous; nor is it easy to understand from what he has written, whether he was a high-churchman or a low-churchman, whilst a member of the English Church. He certainly in his pamphlet represents the English Church as holding low-church, "evangelical" doctrines—to wit in her article on Baptism, in her teaching on the Real Presence, Episcopacy, &c. But unhappily this is no criterion, for the new converts seem to change all their

opinions, not only as regards doctrines, but also as regards facts, so soon as they change their position. Thus doctrines, which whilst members of the English Church they would have strenuously maintained as the plain undoubted teaching of that Church, they at once affirm her to deny, so soon as they leave her. Perhaps in a small unimportant way an amusing instance of this is afforded in the use of the term Protestant. As members of the English Church, these new Romanists would have disclaimed the term, not merely as one of which they disapproved, but as historically untrue and as repudiated formally by our Church. But no sooner are they gone, than history changes, repudiations are forgotten, and the term is used as if it were the most true and expressive one imaginable. They seem to be afflicted with a judicial blindness. However it is not difficult to see that Mr. Northcote, even whilst a member of the English Church, was unconsciously resting on principles, which she does not allow to her children. What wonder then that they gave way and precipitated him into the gulph of Rome. So it must ever be with all, who venture to go beyond, or fall short of, the teaching of their Church. Principles thus held must sooner or later be discovered to be inadmissible in members of our Church; and then arise doubts not of the principles, but of the Church which rejects them; and these doubts increase until they become insupportable, and a refuge is sought there, where they may raise less disturbance in the mind. So fatal is it, to endeavour to teach ourselves and model our own faith, in however slight a degree, when our Church does not warrant us in so doing. If we once begin such a system, we know not where it may stop; if we once

begin to rest on a rotten foundation, we do not know how soon it may give way, and our building, being overbalanced, fall headlong altogether. There is no safety, but in holding in all their fulness all the principles of our Church, and in going beyond none of them. Those who will trifle with dangers, must expect sometime to feel the consequences. We must not allow our faith to be tampered with; we must not stray, however slightly, into forbidden pastures; here we have been placed by Providence; and our business is with the English Church, and not the Roman. We shall indeed find much to discourage us; our daily services are in many places a dead letter; the solemn majesty of our glorious Cathedrals is deserted; their services are slovenly and carelessly performed; our churches are closed throughout the day; we meet with heterodoxy, and find it unreproved and unpunished; and what do we do? Too many begin to murmur and repine; then to doubt and waver. They charge these things upon their Church; they persuade themselves that it is her system, forgetting that it is a violation of it; and then they look abroad, they see another Communion, which seems to be free from these evils; they begin to sigh and long for it; they grow distrustful and impatient, and end by throwing themselves into the arms spread open to receive them, deserting her who had been the nurse of their childhood. So with regard to books,—they dabble in Romanism; their imagination, it may be, becomes excited; they do not think of their danger, but close their eyes to it, and thus they are insensibly led away; they wake up in a Romish mist, and the teaching of their Church looks indistinct, dull, and unpleasing to their eyes; they go on and the process is the same as in the former case. Rome is

cautious enough, she only displays herself by degrees; she allures by the fair side of her countenance: Fenelon, Massillon, Bossuet,—these come first, that the mind may not be disgusted or startled; afterwards other stronger works appear, when the mind has been gradually led on and prepared to receive them. What ought men to do? To be on their guard, to suspect themselves, when they find themselves too much pleased with these Romish works, or too full of longings for Romish fancied perfections. They should doubt their own discontented, impatient spirit, their own overwrought unchecked imagination. They should endeavour to sober themselves, to grow more patient and trustful, and should learn to see what is the real system of their Church, and to live in her real true spirit. Would they but do this, they would find that rest and contentment for which they seek, without passing through forbidden doors.* Moreover they would do well to

* In page 102, Mr. Northcote complains of the "painful feeling," which he experienced, as an Anglican, in reading the Fathers. Did it never occur to him that the "incoherences" were not in his Church but in his own mind? Surely when we think of such men as Hooker, Andrews, Beveridge, Ken, Bull, and others like them; men of a most sincere heart, of an extensive theological learning, (such as none in the present day can equal,) of a most Catholic spirit and primitive piety, and whose minds were moulded by the Ancient Church;—when we consider that they with all their learning felt persuaded of, and maintained, the superior Catholicity of our teaching to the Roman; and though they so heartily entered into the spirit of the Fathers, yet that they, as Anglo-Catholics, felt none of that "impression of strangeness and incongruity," but believed themselves to be truly in "sympathy with the ancient days;"—surely we may well hesitate to trust to our "painful feelings," (if we have any,) and to place our inexperienced ignorance against their learning and experience. We may well believe that the fault is in ourselves, and our own minds; and that if we are but faithful, as our Church did to them so also will she do to us, and give us "the key wherewith to open the secret treasures of Holy Scripture, and make us feel, whether we read the Acts of the Apostles or the writings of the Fathers, that we are really in the same Church with them—the Church alike of all ages, as of all places, One, indefectible, and Catholic." Although Mr. Northcote went to "that source, to which his own communion directed him, the teaching of the Primitive Church; yet his pamphlet more than once betrays, that he did

consider whether the Church of Rome is really so fair as she seems. We must not judge her by her appearance in this land; here she is compelled to look well and conceal her deformities; but let us take her in her own abode, in her natural country, and we shall find few complaints of any description brought against our Church, which have not their parallel, or even their excess in those of the Roman obedience. Do we complain of the Services of our Cathedrals and Churches? let us be placed in some foreign Church or Cathedral during the performance of an ordinary service, and we shall come away much more contented with our own. Do we complain of our divisions and false teaching? We need but look into Romish books of different schools, and our divisions will cease to wear so hopeless and monstrous an appearance. There never was a more false assertion made, than to say that the teaching of Rome is one and uniform. I trust that this will appear in the following pages, and not a little may be found to the same effect in Dr. Wordsworth's Letters on the Church of Rome. She appears to wear a seamless robe; but why? not because her doctors agree, but because she compels them so far as possible to smother their differences. Take for instance, Bossuet's "Exposition of Catholic Doctrine." Here a Bishop of that Church writes an explanation of her doctrines, as laid down by

not go to it *in the way*, in which his own Communion directed. He has accepted, and would have us accept, the mere dogmata of Tradition, or even of a particular age, or of particnlar Fathers, as essential points of faith, without the support of Holy Scripture, without which (by the principles of both the Primitive and our own Church) nothing is to be received. We must remember that the most learned and orthodox Fathers are still not infallible; that even they may lay down false rules, hold unfounded opinions, or give unsafe interpretations, and must not be implicitly followed in all things without questioning. Of this they warn us themselves. Mr. Northcote forgot this, and hence the "painful feelings" and "incoherencies."

the Council of Trent. It was written with the intention of palliating Romish doctrines, and accommodating them to Protestant tastes; it gained the approbation of the Bishops of France, but was disapproved by the Doctors of the Sorbonne, suppressed, and sent forth under a new shape with many most essential alterations. Under its new form it came out with numberless approbations, amongst others, that of the Pope himself; yet shortly afterward a Priest of Bourdeaux was accounted a heretic, for maintaining the same doctrine. The preface to Archbishop Wake's reply, called, "An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England," is worth reading, and betrays some curious facts of Romish unity, and Romish intrigue. Another of their methods of preserving this seeming unity, is by declaring all unpleasant assertions to be only pious opinions, or scholastic tenets on undecided points, though it does not require half an eye to see that the differences are very material, and on points decided by the Council of Trent itself. Again, they will not "authorize" books of doubtful theology, although if they be useful they will say nothing against them. Such has been the case lately; Mr. Newman writes a book in favour of Rome, which goes on a principle wholly opposed to a most fundamental principle of the Council of Trent. The theory of Development overthrows the theory of Tradition.—The theory of Tradition is that, on which all the ablest writers of the Romish Church, and all her accredited doctors, together with the Council of Trent, have rested her teaching; yet Mr. Newman with his theory, utterly subversive of Tradition, is received with open arms; the heresy is overlooked; for a heresy the writers of the early church pronounce his

theory to be; as if in anticipation the Saints of the Primitive Church denounce, in no measured terms, that very doctrine which Mr. Newman advocates, and which the Church of Rome tacitly sanctions in her reception of him. It is mere folly to say that she pronounces no opinion, and has not committed herself to it; she has spoken no words, given no formal approbation; but she has spoken more plainly than by words, she has received with all his errors, without a single protest, the maintainer of this heresy, and has loaded him with favours. —She receives a heretic, with his heresy in his hands, and yet would persuade us that she gives no approbation. And here I would say, that her claim to make a distinction between authorized, and unauthorized publications, is one, which with her should never be admitted. She professes to maintain a perfect unity, to possess a strict inviolable discipline: she must act up to her profession, or acknowledge its emptiness. Yet how can she be said to be acting up to her profession, when her children promulgate uncensured, or when she receives without hesitation those who promulgate, false doctrines. Whatever she permits her children to publish without censure, to that she commits herself;—her silence is a declaration that she does not disapprove of what is written, that she perceives no error of importance in it. Either this must be acknowledged, or she must give up her vaunted boast of unity and discipline. But we find her children often appealing in her defence to that plea of "unauthorised," or "a scholastic tenet;" now let it be remembered that the very taking refuge in such a plea is an acknowledgment, that the doctrine, objected to, and defended on such a plea, cannot be defended on any other. If it could be cleared of its charge of false-

ness, we may be very sure that the attempt would be made; to say simply that it is unauthorised or a scholastic tenet, is to grant that it is false; and then the Church of Rome stands convicted of permitting false doctrine to be maintained within her pale without censure. Where then are her unity and discipline? This boast of Rome is indeed most hollow and unreal; she no more affords unity than any other part of the Church of Christ.

It is no easy matter for a plain enquirer to find out what really is the Romish faith, and the foundation whereon it rests. Tradition is indeed made a groundwork, but then we find ancient testimony kicked over by her modern writers whensoever it presents inconvenient difficulties, and Mr. Newman has taken no slight pains to refute the Catholic test of St. Vincentius. Holy Scripture is the other groundwork, but even that is now declared insufficient and imperfect, because it gives no countenance to many of the most fatal errors of Romanism. The authority of the "present Church," from time to time, is in fact their only recognised authority, and we are now called upon to believe, what the early Church denounced, because the present Romish Church declares it to be true and necessary. We may ask, on what does such an authority rest; we gather from Holy Scripture, and the unanimous consent of the first ages of the Church, that the faith would remain one and the same for ever, and we can find no reason for crediting the authority of the present Church, as Romanists would have us credit it, further than her own unsupported assertion.—She is to be believed, because she says so, notwithstanding the plain opposition of Scripture and Tradition, the two witnesses, to which she herself

professes to appeal. It is a fearful state of things which she has introduced; her theory of development is but a theory of infidelity, and its maintainers are going the surest way to verify our Lord's prediction.—"When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' And with such a theory, what is the use of Scripture? if Scripture is so imperfect and so extremely shadowy, and if the Church has power to enjoin fresh articles of faith from time to time—not only to explain old ones more fully, (which is her proper province,) but to draw forth new ones, (as the theory of development teaches)—then is Scripture worse than a dead letter; under these circumstances it would have been better had it never come down to us, and we must believe that the inspired Apostles were engaged in an useless task, and the Church is a mischievous one, by taking care that the faith should thus be transmitted. It is indeed a happy thing for the Church of Christ, that the Roman Communion, which embraces such a theory, does not constitute the whole Church. If she proceed much further in her course she must soon take to herself the marks of Antichrist. Her writers have already deified the Blessed Virgin, and the doctrine of the immaculate conception has apparently been countenanced by authority.—Yet one can scarcely understand how this doctrine can be maintained without striking at the very root of Christianity. Whilst the same arguments which are used to shew the necessity of the Virgin's immacculate conception would equally go on to prove the necessity of the immaculate conception of her parents and ancestors, all the way upward to Adam. But this pious opinion is one of the dreams of Rome's "holy contemplatives," which she thinks fit to hold in honour, notwithstanding that it has not a shadow

of support in God's word, but on the contrary is opposed to the whole tenour of Scripture, and to the testimony of the Primitive Church. This is one of those opinions, concerning which the Church of Rome is defended on the ground of its being on an undefined point to which therefore she is not bound to turn her eyes.—So is Romish unity maintained at the expence of truth.

We are very much abused by Romanists for using such arguments as these, and are accused of employing the weapons of dissenters against them, and their weapons against dissenters; so that our method of attack upon them would ruin our own defences against Protestantism; and our method of attack against Protestantism would ruin our own defences against them. But it is not so;—we attack Romish doctrines, supporting ourselves by Scripture interpreted by the Primitive Church; and how does she reply? by theories of development, and appeals to the authority of the existing Romish Church; her champions yielding to us that which we require, viz.—that those things to which we object cannot be found in the early Church. Dissenters attack our doctrines, and we rest our defence on the very same ground on which we rested our attack against Romanism; we require both parties to appeal to Scripture, not interpreted as each one pleases for himself, not interpreted by the sole authority of the present Church, but by the rule of St. Vincentius, "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,"—and this is a test, which the ancient Church asserted, but which Rome cannot abide, and which Mr. Newman therefore sedulously endeavours to undermine. The very arguments, by which we establish episcopacy, will be our surest defence against the supremacy. Romanists argue in a circle, they

would fain prove the authority of the Church from Holy Scripture, and in turn the authority of Holy Scripture is made to rest wholly on the authority of the Church. When we ask whence comes this authority of the Church, we are referred to Scripture for its proof, but if we find the same Scripture, which proves the authority of the Church, disproving some other Romish doctrine; then we are accused of an exercise of private judgment, as though the word of God were written to prove only the authority of the Church, and then to be a sealed book; and as though we had not equal right to examine Scripture on other points as well as that. Either let her submit to be tested on every doctrine (for all Scripture is of equal authority and importance) by the word and catholic consent; or let her refuse the test on every point. The latter makes Scripture and antiquity useless, and is totally opposed to the professed principles of the Council of Trent; the former gives them their proper weight, and accords with the professed Tridentine principles; but alas only professed, for we need nothing, but the putting forth of theories of developement, to shew that Rome cannot stand on her own foundations. Here is full admission of all for which we contend.

We think that Mr. Northcote and his friends have laid themselves open to the charge of acting on dissenting principles. Members of the English Church, which requires the warrant of Scripture for everything, they yet allowed themselves to be led away by arguments which did not pretend a scriptural foundation. And now Mr. Northcote would wish us to do the same, appealing to the use of the name "Catholic," when the word does not so much as occur in the Bible; and in

other respects urging the opinions and dicta of the Fathers as if of equal authority with the Divine Word. We receive nothing without the warrant of the latter, however strongly the Fathers may seem to insist upon it; and this is a principle insisted upon over and over again by the ancient writers, and by none more strongly than St. Augustine, that Scripture is all sufficient, alone infallible, without which nothing is of faith.—Yet Romish writers are constantly urging antiquity by itself as a sufficient foundation for their dogmas. And it is a dangerous argument to those who reverence the opinions of the Fathers, without always remembering that after all they are but fallible men, and without always considering that Scripture is silent on the point under discussion, and that therefore it cannot be material.—Nor is this the only point in which the new Romish schismatics approximate to the dissenters; they seem to trust very much to their feelings, and because their excitement has worked them up into a state of fancied peace, such as they never knew before, they decide at once that their feelings are quite a sufficient evidence in favour of the course which they have adopted; they judge by the feelings; we judge by the fruits; and certainly they have hitherto been very different from what might have been expected; we look in vain for an increase of sincerity and charity; instead of this we have a theory of development supporting itself on facts half stated, whilst rumours reach us of words uttered by the author partaking but little of Christian Charity: we have had reports in the papers of strange proceedings, regarding children of his late parishioners, on the part of another well-known convert, who has lately signalized himself by a singularly uncharitable, and discreditable

correspondence with a Methodist teacher; a correspondence, such as few persons would not blush to have taken part in, and which places the Romanist in anything but an enviable position of defeat on all points, by the side of his dissenting adversary. We must be taken beyond the writings and doings of the late converts, in order to be persuaded of the exalted sanctity and perfect unity of the Church of Rome. If the Church of England is to be condemned by such tests as Mr. Northcote applies to her, so interpreted, verily her sister of Rome is in still greater danger. Not that I would pretend to say that there are no evils in our own branch of the Church Catholic, for the evils are many and very great, and our present position is painful in the extreme;—yet there is every sign of the dawning of a better day; men seem awakening to Church duties and Church privileges, and we have now a larger amount of Catholic spirit abroad, than has existed for more than a century, The leaven is working, and we need not doubt, that it will in due time leaven the whole lump. The present is doubtless a most anxious and critical time, but we must be patient, and wait the good pleasure of that God, who has so often rescued us in the hour of danger. It were well that we should not be too hasty, and not insist upon immaterial unessential points, however desirable, to the breach of peace. Yet let those who thus determine be fully sure that those things, which they think immaterial and unessential, are really so, that they really do not involve a principle. Men are too apt in these days to think that great principles are only involved in great things, whereas there are many, very many, seemingly trifling things, which if carefully examined, are seen to contain great results.—Things

which at first sight appear mere trifling forms, are often full of a most important spirit. Let men beware then how they decide that things are unimportant; and above all, let them not yield to clamour; those who stand firmly on their principles, and at the same time charitably and courteously, manifesting also their sincerity by their own lives, their own zeal and diligence; such men may rest fully assured that their sincerity will gain respect for their pripciples; their very firmness in such a case, and so displayed, will win them esteem, and in the end co-operation. If they act thus, they will soften the hearts even of their enemies, and gain their point at last. But of course they cannot expect to do this, if they assume a needlessly harsh and domineering manner, or if they do not display in their own lives that their zeal is practical and sincere. I do not mean that they must seem to submit, this will never do: no, they must maintain their own authority whole, only maintain it sincerely and courteously. They will gain nothing by yielding: those who yield up principles to clamour will lose all the respect even of those whom they are seeking to oblige or win. Their authority is at an end for ever; they place themselves at the mercy of their opponents, and happy will they be if they do not feel the constant effects of it, in the retarding of their future ministry. Whether bishops or parish priests, they will feel this equally to be the case. Let each fearlessly and firmly lay down their principles and act upon them firmly. I cannot but think, that had the Bishop of London so acted a few years since, he would have long ago found his point gained, and a most important step made towards future more perfect conformity; by fear and by yielding he lost more than he gained. Had the charge

never been given it would have been different; having been given, surely it had better have been enforced at all hazard. We are constantly told that such doings will bring on a division in our Church; probably they would, but the Church would be the stronger for her loss. Much better were it that she should number a small band of one heart and soul, than a large mixed multitude at variance. The threatened loss would be her greatest strength. Many moreover, who now incline through ignorance to Puritanism, would shrink back, and leave their errors, when they beheld their Church plainly declaring herself. The Puritan body within would become a mere sect without, and then it would be looked upon by many with very different eyes from those with which they now survey it. The Ancient Church did not shrink from casting forth her heretical members, however numerous and powerful; and however grievously she was thereby troubled for a time, yet the event always proved the wisdom of the course; her boldness and willingness to make a fearful sacrifice at first, in the end obtained for her peace and purity. And so we should find now; and surely our Church might with a much surer and juster confidence reckon on the assistance and support of her Lord, when taking a bold open, self-sacrificing course; than when proceeding fearfully, and speaking hesitatingly, and permitting the truth to be corrupted, that she might remain in a dangerous rest, which, after all, daily experience proves to be no rest, but endless strife and anxiety. These are not days when the Church can afford to be disunited; she needs her whole united unshackled strength to resist with success the many adversaries around her. Would that her rulers would see this more plainly, and speak and act

more decidedly, not only against Romanism, but against Puritanism; would that her priests were less fearful, less temporising. One thing surely might be done; let every clergyman who preaches heretical doctrine be reported to his Bishop; let the Bishop's attention be clearly and specially directed to his errors, in such a manner that notice must be taken of them. If our spiritual rulers hold back, surely some means might be adopted which must bring them forward. I do not mean, to complain of mere generalities in a mere general way; but to make specific charges in a formal manner against unorthodox clergy to their own Bishops; draw the Bishop's attention to some particular words uttered at some particular time, so that there may be a distinct specific charge, such as cannot be evaded. As it is, many of our parishes are guided by the opinions of retired military gentlemen and elderly ladies, and obtuse squires who dabble in theology, who are seldom sound, and whom their pastors, or rather preachers, are above all things anxious to please. It is very desirable that they should be taught that they are not to teach, but to be taught; not to govern, but to be governed; yet so long as our spiritual rulers allow heresy to continue its course unchecked, this lamentable and disgraceful state of things will last. Let the Bishops speak out, and act decidedly, and military gentlemen, puritan preachers, and elderly ladies, will either be silent or utter their complaints and heresies without the pale of the Church. Of course it requires some amount of courage to decide on such a positive course: we are so selfish and luxurious in these days, that we would fain put off the evil day as long as possible The cross lies at our feet and we like to persuade ourselves that if

it is not laid upon us, we may pass it by. We forget that the command is not only to bear, but to "take up" the cross; that we are not only to wait, not only to submit to the yoke, but to take it ourselves upon our necks. We know that we must be conformed to the image of our Saviour in all things and have our part in His sufferings; if we would reign with Him, we must suffer with Him. We must be made like to Him; conformed to His image in all things, suffering amongst the rest; it is through suffering that we are perfected; each trial is an evidence and assurance of our adoption and acceptance; an earnest of our Father's love; without trials we know that we cannot be perfected; unless chastised, we are none of His. We ought then to love our chastisements, not only to be contented under them; to joy in our trials, not only to be resigned; earthly sorrow should be the comfort and happiness of the soul; the cross should not only be received with trustful patience, but should be welcomed with faithful joy; without it we cannot be made like our Head nor have part in Him; without it we cannot be the true children of God. In all things the cross should be hailed and taken up with hope and faith; how much more willingly and readily, when it will be borne for the sake of that Church which Christ died to form; how glad ought we to be, we her poor weak sinful children, if called upon to be crucified for her, our spiritual Mother, the daughter of our God, the spouse of our Redeemer. Let us then not shrink from boldly and fearlessly performing our duty to her, because we foresee persecution and distress beyond. Our past is with the present, not the future; with present duties, not future consequences; they must be left in humble trust to

God, for He knoweth what is best; He loveth us far more than we love ourselves, and will make all things work together for good, if we love Him, and shew our love by our ready obedience to His will. We all seek too much how *little* of the cross we may bear, even when we raise it, we are prone to look to earthly helps to lighten the burden, instead of joyfully bearing it *all;* and thus in truth we make it not lighter but heavier; it is ever more wearisome when borne unwillingly, or when borne only in part, than when borne readily and altogether. Let us not seek to sweeten the bitter of the cup with earthly medicaments; let us not set it down, satisfied with only half of its contents; nay, let us drink it all, in all its bitterness; and it will refresh us and taste sweet, and be a fountain of living water, springing up unto everlasting life. We may be sure that all the bitterness, all the draught, of that cup is needful for us, or God would never place it at our lips, we cannot be refreshed and led to our journey's end unwearied, unless we drink it all to the very dregs. To put it from us, to alloy it with earthly sweets, is to reject that, without which we cannot run our course and win the goal at last. To shrink back then, because we see trials before us, to temporise and seek earthly means to lighten and avert those trials, is to be faithless to God, and unloving children of His Church, and is the surest way to make our trials the more severe and prolonged, to lose our own eternal rest, and to encompass our Church with difficulties and dangers to the end of time. We must indeed be wise as serpents and harmless as doves; but we must be also bold and firm.

Sure if in any cause we may trust on God, we may do so in such a cause as this—yea and we may be

sanguine also. Our aim is, we firmly believe, a good one; and if we seek not that which is against God's will, we are bound to be in some degree sanguine, to have some hope. To despair of the accomplishment of our wishes is to doubt the providence, and mistrust the power of God; in all our good desires we must have some hope, or we are faithless, for nothing is impossible with God; but if in all things we should in some degree be sanguine, much more must we in all be trustful; to be sanguine is to believe that our wishes will be accomplished, and this may belong to the evil as well as to the good; but to be trustful is to believe that God will make all things work together for our good, and to commit the future wholly to Him in firm faith that what he shall eventually order, (whether the accomplishment or frustration of our hopes and wishes) will be really best; confining onrselves to present duties and entrusting the result to Him, prepared to receive with equal thankfulness and peace, either success or disappointment; this belongs only to the good. And this trust must we exercise as regards our efforts for the Church; we must do our present duty, and leave the future to God. We must, in that trust, enter boldly on our path; it were better that we gaze not too much on the future, for thus we shall conjure up phantoms which will alarm us, and cause us to shrink back; God in mercy hides the future in all events: were all our dangers displayed to us at once we might be unwilling to begin our journey; our hearts would sink within us at the prospect of our coming troubles, and therefore He leads us on by degrees, suiting our trials to our powers of endurance. Thus we find that troubles which at the beginning would have scared, now come as

ordinary trials; so that on looking back on the dangers we have surmounted, we should wonder how our strength could have ever sufficed to bear us through them, and our courage have led us to encounter them, were it not that we see how each successive one found us more and more prepared by the suffering which went before. If we trust in God, we may be sure that if trial awaits us in our duty, He will give us strength to bear it; therefore we may not shrink back through fear of the unseen future; if He should not see fit to bless our labours and zeal in the way, in which we hope and wish, still we must rest assured that He will make all things work together for good; we must be prepared to meet disappointment or success with the same meekness, the same trustful thankfulness, knowing that it is His will. Yet surely may we be sanguine also as well as trustful, surely there are signs of a better spirit abroad in the land; let us but contrast the present with the state of our Church a few years since, and how vast is the improvements in zeal, in reverence for Church ordinances, in appreciation of Church principles; in this very parish in which I dwell, although there is abundant room for improvement, yet much has been done, and more will, it is hoped, ere long be performed. It is no longer a Church opened one day in the week; ere many weeks are passed we shall have besides our daily service, the blessing of frequent communions administered, not on Sundays only, but on all the Saints days and Holy days of the Church; perhaps also on every Sunday in the year; and yet all this is in a place where no long time since Church ordinances were looked upon as mischievous forms, and daily prayers as a remnant of Popery. And in how many places is not

this the case! the very appearance and ordering of our Churches display the same truth; the worship is not only frequent and spiritual, but done decently and in order; the theory of our Church has ceased to be a mere letter, we may constantly behold it carried out in practice, and see its blessed fruits. Men are beginning to see the blessedness of the daily worship in the sanctuary; they are beginning to find how those morning devotions hallow the whole day, and are a safeguard against the world; how the evensong soothes and calms the wearied spirit after the cares and turmoils of their earthly vocation. Truly it hath a blessedness and comfort peculiarly its own, known only to those who testify from experience. The support and strength and consolation therein afforded cannot be uttered worthily in words; that realising of our separation from the world, that raising ourselves out of it and above it, that uniting in close communion with our brethren and all the Saints of God and with Himself in His peaceful and holy Temple shed a soothing softness over this troublous life, which change its fainting weariness into rest and hope.

One thing alone seems wanting, and that is, that our churches should be open for private devotion each day. The poor in their close and crowded garrets have not the power of offering up an uninterrupted worship; and they would joyfully hail the throwing open the house of God; and not they only, but many of the rich would gladly avail themselves of shutting out the world awhile in the calm seclusion of the House of God, or amid the solemn and unearthly loneliness of the deep cathedral aisle. No reasons of any, even the least, weight have as yet been offered against this blessing, whilst in those

places wherein the system has been tried, it has succeeded beyond expectation, and been accepted by numbers with the deepest gratitude. The aid to devotion thus afforded, is inestimable, but in this as in other such matters, there is an earnest feeling silently but surely growing up; and if the rulers and pastors of our Church will but be bold and firm, they will find themselves upheld by no mean support, such as the Puritan opposition will in all human probability never be able to overcome. We shall hear no longer of Romish sanctity and Romish unity; we shall be taunted no longer with the weakness and undisciplined state of our Church; her children will place in her the full unbounded confidence of loving hearts, for they will see that God is with her to bless her, and they will feel within themselves the peace and hope which she can fully give. They will begin to feel that men of the deepest learning and most earnest piety, such as Hooker, Herbert, Andrews, Laud, with a host of others, were really living members of the Catholic Church; they will begin to see that the Communion which they judged to be safe is really a road to heaven; that the theory which they rejected is really no essential part of the Christian scheme; they will see that such men as these were less likely to err in their judgments, than their weak sinful unlearned selves. It is not in reality because the Romish claim is valid, but because the English Church has been slothful, that her sons have become dissatisfied and unloving; it is because she has not been robed in her own fair dress that they have been disgusted, and fled from her.

It remains only to say that the following pages lay but little claim to originality; nor on such a subject, so

often and so fully discussed, would it be any recommendation to say that what is written is original. I thought it better to confine myself so much as I could to the old writers of our Church, and to such modern ones as gave the greatest information; amongst the latter I have been specially indebted to Mr. Palmer.

CHURCHES OF ENGLAND AND ROME BRIEFLY TESTED,

&c. &c.

Few more painful tasks have of late been imposed on English Churchmen, than the perusal of the various reasons which have led the wanderers from our fold to strange and forbidden pastures. It is sad to see what vain sophistries have swayed the intellect and warped the judgment, and to trace the course run by those minds which wavered in distrust, and at length fell. In all we find some under-current eating away the foundations of their faith, long before the surface of the waters shewed any symptom of the troubled state beneath. "Ideals" were formed of a Christian Church, according to the fancy of their own minds; lurking distrust of their own communion; a desire to model the Church, wherein they were placed, to their own views; an impatience and unteachableness of spirit: these and numberless other unhealthy symptoms, unknown at the time, yet clearly set forth when the disease had at length done its worst, grew stronger and stronger with a daily

increase, until at length the last struggle was ended, and their faith and obedience were dead. It is scarce possible to read the apologies of those who have left us, without discovering, from their own words, that it is not the fault of their church, but of themselves, which drove them from her bosom to take refuge in a communion both schismatical and corrupt. There is also another most distressing feature in the cases of many of the seceders,—the rapidity with which their judgments were formed. With many a few months, almost a few weeks, seem to have been enough; and a research and a time which would have been thought insufficient, if given to weighty affairs of the world, were deemed enough in order to decide upon matters of heaven and of eternity. Nor does Mr. Northcote appear in a different position, as regards these points, from the rest of those who have taken the same fatal step. One can trace throughout his pamphlet the workings of a mind, unconsciously distrusting and dissatisfied with his Church long before that distrust raised its voice so loudly as to alarm him; but perhaps it would be unnecessary to read more than the first three pages which he has written in order to see this most clearly. It will be well indeed, that "the path which led him into the Catholic Church" should never be trodden by members of the Anglican Church: and it is perhaps also well, that this is from the first so plain, because it puts the mind upon the guard, and makes the reader more cautious than he otherwise might be.

The line of argument which he has adopted seems at first sight plausible, yet really it is a fallacious one. We of course at once admit that the Church of Christ is One, and Holy, and Catholic, and Apostolic; but we

equally at once deny the applicability of these terms as tests, because we are at issue with Rome, at least as to the definitions of unity and sanctity. Hence a fallacy runs throughout his writing; there is a constant confusion; a constant considering of the English Church, as though she claimed to be herself the Catholic Church, instead of merely a part of the whole. His reasoning may be correct, if the Romish theory be established and admitted; but before his arguments can effect us, he must prove that the Anglican theory is unsound. Until this is done, all which he builds upon his assumed theory must fall to the ground. Unhappily however, this mode of reasoning is not always harmless; there is a fair show made at the beginning, just as Mr. Northcote says, "it cannot but be fair to look on that Church (the Church of England) in the character which you yourself assign to it"—this lulls the mind; we take it for granted that our own theory is to be made the basis of the argument and to be attacked. But this is not the case; one or two slight attempts to disprove it are made, but are soon dismissed; and the argument really proceeds on the theory maintained by Rome. This is forgotten or overlooked; hence the reader becomes puzzled, and even fancies that Rome has proved her point, when really she has been arguing on quite a different subject from that which we require to have proved. The question which concerns us is, not whether Rome is *more* perfect than we are, but whether she is the only Church, whether we are not what we claim to be, a part of the Catholic Church equally with herself and the Churches of her obedience.—To some it may seem that England has rejected means of grace which Rome still retains—they may think that Rome is the truer, purer, safer

Church, with better doctrine and better discipline, yet even this, (if it were true) would not prove her to be the only Church, and ourselves not one of the branches, and therefore would in no degree excuse our deserting for her communion that part of the vineyard in which we are placed. This would be to commit the sin of schism. We must be convinced of the validity of the Papal claim, of the untenableness of our own position, of the schismatical character of the Reformation—no conviction short of this, can be any excuse for our changing for another that communion wherein we are placed by God—we must abide his good time to lighten our chastening, to make up what is wanting, to purify what is unclean, waiting in patience, humility, and faith. Our Church pretends not to perfection nor to infallibility; she claims not to be whole, and therefore she is liable to err. But she does claim to possess all the needful means of grace, of holiness, and of salvation; and therefore she calls upon her children to believe in her teaching, to maintain her cause, and to trust in her sufficiency.

Neither do we affirm that our present position is one to be wished, or that it is free from all difficulty; we acknowledge and deplore our defects; we grant that testimony may be brought against us from the teaching of the Ancient Church; and that Rome may find much seemingly in favour of her claims.—But we also say, that all these apparent supports of Rome admit of explanation; that on the other hand the testimonies in our favour are not easily to be removed; that in a word if we have difficulties to combat, Rome has difficulties infinitely greater, and more numerous. She has been driven from one position to another, until at length her

advocates are compelled to take refuge in a Theory of Developement; a theory to which they would never have had recourse, unless obliged to do so, and which is strongly opposed to the words of the Council of Trent. That Council proposes to found its faith on the written word and the traditions handed down from the beginning; anathematizes those who do not observe both these with equal reverence;* and declares that all baptized persons are bound to maintain the traditions of the Church,† thereby virtually declaring against a developement in the Christian Religion, albeit such declaration nullifies many of its own decrees;—decrees opposed to the plain words of the "Catholic doctors of the undivided Church."

With regard to unity, the Anglican Church does certainly admit that there is a visible bond of union throughout the Christian kingdom. She regards the Church as one in origination, because sprung from Christ and his Apostles; one in hope, even that of eternal blessedness; one in charity, because all her members have love one toward another; one in discipline, because all the divisions of that kingdom have the same order of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; one in Sacraments, because throughout her borders all are admitted to her privileges by the same washing, and nourished by the same heavenly food; and one in faith, because all her members make the same profession, and hold the same Apostolic and Ancient Creeds. Thus there are tokens by which, we believe, the Church to be recognisable; tangible bonds, by which unity is preserved. Those who are without these tokens, we cannot recognise as parts of the Christian family, as members of the

* Sessio iv., "de Canonicis Scripturis."
† Sessio vii., canon viii., de Baptismo.

one body—we nevertheless do not say, that those who *add* to these tokens, are therefore cut off from the unity of the Church. All which is necessary of faith and discipline, and Sacraments being retained, we acknowledge those who thus retain all which is essential, even though the purity and beauty of the original be polluted, defaced, and obscured by grievous corruptions and additions. We hold that visible intercommunion is indeed a truly desirable thing, but not essential to the being of the Church,—it is an accident, not necessary. This is the theory which must be overthrown, before Rome argue against us on the ground of our position; a theory which however Mr. Northcote thinks it sufficient to call "a theory on paper contradicted by the experience of three hundred years;" and thus he leaves it. As for his argument that the English Church denounces the Roman as Anti-Christ in the Homilies, I can scarcely think that he would have felt himself thus bound to the *letter* of the Homilies, were he still a member of the English Church; and assuredly no one could honestly venture to affirm that members of the English Church are so bound by the words of her articles. It never was so considered, and she has ever allowed that the Church of Rome was a part of the Catholic Church, although fallen from original purity.—And for the testimony brought in support of his view from the Eclectic Review, I cannot conceive what value he can attach to words written by an enemy to both parties, who would desire nothing better than to throw additional difficulties in the way, and overturn thereby the Churches both of England and Rome. But this is a kind of evidence to which he has more than once had recourse—though surely of a most unfair kind,—because, let it be remem-

bered, it is not the evidence of one who stands calmly by, uninterested in the dispute; but it is the evidence of one, who feels a deep interest in the point at issue, and whose aim it is to widen the breach, with the hope that, by keeping the Churches apart, they will at last the more easily fall.

Nor ought our belief of Church Unity to be thus summarily dismissed, as having no ground upon which to rest, saving human fancy and invention. Anglicans can see abundance of proof, in Scripture and the writings of antiquity, for such a belief.—And it is to no purpose that we have it so constantly urged by the Apologists of Rome, that the Christian Church is "a Building," "a Family," "a Kingdom," "a Body." The walls of a building may be rent to the very foundation, so that there should be no connection between its parts, except that both are joined on to one foundation, and thereby make up but one building. A family may be at variance amongst its different members, so that bond there can be none amongst them, excepting that one which must ever remain, their same original from one father. A kingdom may be full of convulsions and distractions, one part set against another; such, for instance, as was the Persian, one of the great monarchies revealed to Daniel. That kingdom was divided into satrapies, independent of each other, and notoriously given to disagreements and warfare amongst themselves; so that, excepting so far as they were all subjects to the one king, owning his authority, and thereby forming one kingdom, none could have recognised them as having any connection with each other. The same may be said as regards the body, though this is a comparison which admits of less accurate argument, inas-

much as we know not what is the seat and source of life in the body, as we do in the Church, and her other similitudes.

In the body, indeed, so far as we can perceive, there is no one particular seat of life—loss of the head, or of the heart, or of various members, will destroy life; sometimes even the unhealty state of an apparently trifling limb, which, at other times, may be wholly taken away without any material injury to the general vitality. In Scripture the head is always regarded as the source of life, so that, provided a limb were joined on to the head, and still retained its channels of life, it might live, even though torn from the rest of the body. But this similitude cannot be much pressed, unless we can discover some one sole source of life, such as we know Christ to be to His Church. A tree again, may be torn asunder to its very roots, the divided parts may have no union above the earth, yet, nevertheless both may live, forming but one tree, because springing from one root. Division does not imply destruction; the house is undoubtedly less safe, the kingdom less prosperous, the family less perfect, the body less healthy, the tree less strong, by these violent rendings; yet, nevertheless are they not either overthrown, or destroyed; they still live and still stand. And thus do we hold concerning the Church; undoubtedly she is more perfect, and more beautiful, when undivided; division is beyond question, a great blemish to herself, and a great aid to her adversaries; but perfection was never promised to her—and perfect union would be a state of perfection. We know that she is "the pillar and ground of the truth;" yet that truth may shine less brightly at one time than another. Nothing essential to salvation can ever be

lost, but it may be obscured; it may grow dim in one place, but it will shine in another; the truth will always be found within her, prevailing with more or less strength, shining more or less brightly. So also no fatal error can ever universally prevail; she can never stamp with the seal of her authority a deadly heresy; yet we have no promise that errors and corruptions may not spread widely through her borders. Perfect purity of doctrine, and perfect union, although strongly enforced, seem nowhere promised in Holy Writ. Christ indeed prayed for the perfect union of His Church; but a prayer is not a promise. Far be it from any of us to make light of the sin of schism, for we know it to be very grievous and deadly; and sorrow must it be to our loving Redeemer, to find those for whom he died, casting aside the bonds of love. Yet we are his family, though at variance; his kingdom, though striving one with another. Those who wilfully bring dissension into his Church, who wilfully refuse to listen, when called to re-union, must, in truth, incur his wrath. And, for this cause, we must believe that the Church of Rome will have to render a fearful account, in that her pride and want of brotherly love stirred up strife and ill-will, and marred the peace of Christ's family; trusting, however, that both the raisers up and maintainers of this strife may meet with mercy, because their deeds are those of ignorance, the consequences of education, and of prejudice. According to the spirit of the words of St. Augustine, "those who use no wilful obstinacy in the defence of their opinions, however false and perverse, especially when not the offspring of their own bold presumption, but received from parents who were seduced into error, and who are anxious to know the

truth, willing to be corrected when it is discovered, are by no means to be thought heretics."

Anglo-Catholics build their theory of Church unity on the sure foundation of the word of God, and support it by the testimony of the Ancient Church. The Saviour prayed that his Disciples might all be one; "as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they may be one in us . . . I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one;"* and accordingly St. Paul calls Christians "one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."† "So then," saith St. Hilary, "we are all one, because both the Father is in Christ and Christ in us," "we truly under a mystery receive the flesh of his body, and thereby shall become one because the Father is in him, and he in us."‡ This is the unity of the whole Church which we believe; an unity of all her members with Christ, and through him with one another, an unity maintained by faithfully receiving the Holy Sacraments of our Lord's institution, administered by those ordained to their office by the successors of the Apostles. We believe in no divine appointment of an universal patriarch, but we hold with St. Cyprian,|| that, "no one constitutes himself a Bishop of Bishops, or by a tyrannous fear drives his colleagues to the necessity of obeying him, since every Bishop, according to the reach of his liberty and power, hath his own free judgment, and can no more be judged by others, than he can himself judge others." And we say with St. Jerome;§ "wherever there is a Bishop, whether at Rome, or Eugubium, he is of the same authority, and the same priesthood; the power of wealth, and the lowliness

* St. John xvii., 21. † Romans xii., 5. ‡ De Trinitate viii., 14.
§ Concil. Carthag. de Hæret. baptizandis. || Ad Evagr. Epi. 85.

of poverty, makes not a Bishop either higher or lower." We regard all Bishops, as by divine institition, of equal power and authority, and each fully independent of another. "The Episcopate is one, of which a share is possessed by each Bishop as freehold;"* and each is a centre of unity in his own diocese, so that, as without a Bishop there is no Church, wherever a Bishop does exist, there "the Church is the people united with the Priest, and the flock adhering to its own pastor: whence you should know that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop."† And thus is the whole Church one; each flock united to its Bishop; and each Bishop united to all others by their joint share in that one Episcopate; and all joined on thereby to Christ, because from him through the Apostolical succession, is derived from the beginning, and for ever, that Episcopal power and Priestly office. "Thence,"—to quote again the words of St. Cyprian,‡—"the ordination of Bishops, and the method of the Church runs on through the changes of times and of successions, so that the Church is founded on the Bishops, and every act of the Church is ruled by the same governors." This is a far truer unity, than that which Rome would impose upon us, placing us all under one supreme head on earth, to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or no; a system of her own devising becoming gradually more developed and confirmed in time through various favouring circumstances, yet established not without protest and opposition, and positively refused in more cases than one, by the Ancient Church. To those who maintain it, there arise for consideration, the refusal of the Eastern Church to submit to Pope

* St. Cyprian de Unitate. † St. Cyprian Ep. lxix., ad Florent.
‡ Ep. xxvii., ad Lapsos.

Victor concerning Easter; the appeal of the Spanish Church from the Pope to St. Cyprian, and his reversal of the Papal decree; the opposition of that same Saint, to Pope Stephen, even to the enduring of withdrawal of communion; the words of Firmilian on that same question, in which he plainly asserts, that Stephen had by his violence cut off himself from the Church; the conduct of the eastern Church throughout the troubles in the time of St. Meletius, together with the canonisation of that Saint by the whole Church, although a Bishop in opposition to the one acknowledged by Rome; and to mention no more, the conduct, and decision, and decrees of the African Church in the matter of Apiarius; the circumstances of which would fully bear out the course adopted by the Church of England, even had they stood alone, as a witness. There is enough, and more than enough, of ancient testimony to prove, that the primitive Church was divided in external communion, and that men could be members of the Church, and even rank among the blessed, although Rome barred against them the approach to her altars.

Mr. Northcote must therefore consider this question more deeply, must take more pains to overturn our system, and to cast forth the foundations of our theory, before Anglo-Catholics will so quietly admit, that it is merely "a theory on paper." And his quick decision notwithstanding, the members of the Anglican Church will still believe, that there is a vital intercommunion between herself and all the other Churches of Christ through the Sacraments, the Creeds, and the Episcopate, although the perfect and visible bond of full brotherly love be broken.

More has been said upon this point of general

Church Unity, than might have seemed necessary from Mr. Northcote's brief notice, and summary dismissal of the question. But this very brevity appears to call for a more lengthened consideration, because men are too apt, when they see a theory thus treated with contempt and discarded, to believe that it really has no ground of support, and that it really is deserving of the scorn which is heaped upon it. How very slightly such a subject can be treated in a few pages, must at once be obvious to all; and what has been said upon the point, was written more in order to throw out hints, and to shew that our belief is not so vain and absurd, as our adversaries would lead us to suppose, than to make any pretensions to being at all an enquiry into the subject, or the whole proof of which the Anglican theory is capable. Mr. Northcote passes on from this subject to the consideration of the disagreements of the Anglican Church within herself; disagreements of which no one would for a moment pretend to deny or fail to lament the existence. Yet even here he has endeavoured to draw from them conclusions, which they will not warrant.

We can none of us for a moment deny that it is upon a most important and cardinal point on which members of the Church of England are divided; in fact it must be admitted that a mass of heresy has succeeded to the former state of apathy in which some years since the English Church lay, but nevertheless we equally maintain that it is not the fault of the English Church, or her system; but it is the fault of a relaxed and imperfect discipline, and the trammels thrown around her by the state.— And, notwithstanding Mr. Northcote's expressions of doubt, we may well believe, that an improved discipline

would produce a more healthy state—the Evangelical party would gain but little support from the Bishops on the agitated question of baptismal regeneration; and should convocation be again restored to our Church, there can be but little doubt that the baptismal office would be maintained in all its integrity. Neither is the voice of the English Church so doubtful as Mr. Northcote would have us believe; if the articles seem to bear a latitudinarian interpretation, we are not to be judged by the articles alone—the Book of Common Prayer is all of equal authority, and the closer and more decided language of our services must be taken into account at the same time,—neither is it at all difficult to harmonize the two; for the articles are not Calvinist, they require to be twisted to make them so,—and especially when guarded by the Liturgy their meaning is plain enough. Because the laws of the English Church compel us to accept the first four general councils; she does not, therefore, say that general councils are infallible; she does no more than assert that those councils decreed the truth, and are therefore to be received, but not from any infallibility, which, of necessity, and by their own nature, existed in them. And it really is somewhat puzzling to see the force of the observations made on Articles 23 and 36. With regard to the 27th, it is quite well, that Mr. Northcote writes, that the opponents of the baptismal office appeal to it, "not without plausibility;" for, saving "plausibility," they most assuredly have no other ground for the appeal.—I see not how its language can be regarded as different in meaning from the baptismal office; neither does Mr. Northcote himself treat it with fairness, for one might have imagined from his way of speaking, that the Article declared

grace to be *given* "by virtue of prayer unto God," instead of "increased." Indeed, one scarcely sees how the voice of the Church of England can be regarded as ambiguous by those, who will fairly judge her by all, which she regards as of authority. Certainly she does not copy her Roman sister in anathematising all who dissent from her teaching; because, though she believes her teaching to be true, yet she pretends not to infallibility; she regards herself not as the Church Catholic, but as a part thereof. She holds that "Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation;" yet she permits not each one of her children to use his own judgment in its interpretation. Believing that the nearer she approaches to the source, the purer will be the stream, she has drawn her faith from Scripture, as explained by the Doctors of the primitive and undivided Church; aided by their abundant teaching, she has set forth her own, resting it on the authority not of herself, nor of any mere part, however large, but of the pure and undivided Catholic Church. Hence, teaching that, which she believes to be true, she calls upon her children to obey her voice and listen to her words; and if they are disobedient, and following their own fancies and erring judgments, leave her communion, she mourns over them as lost through self will and schism. Those who thus desert her, do so at their own peril; for however much any other Church might be supposed to excel her in purity, and perfection, and truth, this will be no excuse for the schism; nothing will pardon that, unless he who divides from his Church, does so because her corruption and mutilation is so hopeless that the channels of grace within her exist no longer. This, and this only, can justify the act; and he, who convinced of this,

proceeds to act upon it, acts on his own risk, and at the peril of his salvation, if he be wrong. We do not, then, admit division to be of the essence of the English Church, but the consequence of her own long slothfulness, and her present fettered position; we maintain that her teaching is really distinct and clear, and that she commands her children to believe, and interpret the word of life, under guidance of that teaching, and in accordance with it. Neither, had she the power to speak authoritatively, would she even in this day submit to any change in that teaching, but would still hold herself aloof from Roman corruptions on the one hand, and Genevan faithlessness on the other.

That her Bishops, her Clergy, and her people are now divided, is indeed a cause for the deepest sorrow; but it has its parallel (whatever Mr. Northcote may say to the contrary,) in the Roman Church, since the days of the Reformation: before however considering this point, I would just remark, that I do not believe the *practical* consequences of the disagreement on baptismal regeneration to be such as we are told.—Mr. Close believes the prayer of faith heard, and grace thereby given, and with this "hope" he would train up his children in the paths of righteousness, equally with an Anglo-Catholic. They would not be left to grow in sin; personal holiness would be inculcated from the hope entertained that they acted through grace; the great practical danger of the Evangelical doctrine seems to be despair.

It was said that the Roman Church since the Reformation, will afford parallels to the present state of the Anglican; and here it may be as well to state the true position of the Anglican, because Romanists would fain

treat the question, as though we claimed to be the one Catholic and infallible Church. Ours is but one of many members, having authority only over her own children, and liable to be deceived, yet claiming our obedience. She is therefore in the position of any one particular Church of primitive times, as of that of Jerusalem, or Gaul, not in the position of the whole Church. Neither does she claim for her Articles that force, which Rome claims for the decrees of Trent;—the two stand on a very different footing, as to the light in which those who are bound by them regard them.—The Church of England is to us, what the Pope (according to the Cismontane theory) is to the Churches of the Roman obedience, although fallible, yet to be obeyed; and our articles hold precisely the same position with us, that a Papal Bull does with members of the Church of Rome. When, therefore, Romish theologians argue, as does Mr. Northcote, contrasting the obedience of all within the Romish Church to the Tridentine decrees and their uniformity of teaching in consequence, with the want of obedience to our formularies and the want of uniformity in our teaching, they argue unfairly; because Romanists hold the Tridentine decrees, as decrees of the Infallible Catholic Church, and infallibly true; and therefore they have no choice but obedience and uniformity without thinking of questioning their truth; whereas we believe our formularies to be the judgment of a fallible part of the Church, and therefore not necessarily true by any virtue of the authority which decrees them. Nevertheless, we may meet the advocates of Rome even here, for she has had dissensions not on mere open question; not even on Papal Bulls; but on the decrees of Trent themselves does she speak with a most varying voice.

We may, therefore, draw a parallel, further than we are bound to draw it in strict fairness, because, to make it fair, we should either have to regard the Church of England as claiming, like Rome, to be the whole Church; which she does not; or we must regard the Church of Rome as admitting herself, like the Church of England, to be only a part of the Church; which she positively refuses to do. If, then, as Mr. Northcote says, we should earnestly look for unity in the English Church, because claiming to herself so high a degree of purity; how much more should we look for it in the Church of Rome, which claims to herself to be the Church Catholic, in opposition to, and to the exclusion of, all, which disagree with her. The first point, to which ones attention is naturally turned, is one which Mr. Northcote calls, "a mere speculative difference as to the limits of the Pope's prerogative, which have never yet been defined," and he adds, "these speculative disagreements occasion no practical inconvenience." This certainly sounds strange, that we should be told, the whole Church, (not his own patriarchate only) must bow to the decision of one man, and obey him, whether he be infallible or not; and that this can "occasion no practical inconvenience." This is a favourite way with the Apologists of Rome, of putting such cases; Dr. Milner admits that they have "disputes in their schools, but these disputes are not about articles of faith." Dr. Baines also asserts—"The doctrines of the Catholic religion are everywhere the same. Not a difference will be found in any single article of faith amongst all its countless millions." In reply to these assertions, it may be sufficient to direct the reader to Bossuet's "Defence of the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy," where he

says, that Bellarmine, Stapleton, &c., hold the Gallican doctrine of the superiority of a general council to the Pope, to be *heretical*, and that Christianus Lupus, Nicholas Dubois, the Bishop of Strigonium, &c., regard the question as one *de fide*. Nicholas Cevoli even maintained that, "The propositions of the Gallican Clergy are every one taken out of Calvin's Institutes, and are plainly *heretical;* that the Bishops who confirmed them are, as schismatics and heretics, cut off from the Church, and *ipso facto* deprived of all episcopal jurisdiction; that their communion should be avoided, and even that they ought to be *burned.*" On the other side, the Cardinal of Lorraine, and Richerius, with a great number of others, held that the Ultramontane doctrine, as condemned by the Councils of Constance and Basil, was *heretical.* Even Bossuet says, in his "defensio," "that the question is one *de fide*, though he does not condemn the Ultramontanes as heretics."* One cannot help thinking, that when it becomes a matter of dispute, as to whether one is, or is not to be, "burned" as a heretic, the question does somewhat assume a practically inconvenient character; and there is one point which it shews most clearly, that many existed of note in the Romish Church, whose opinions would have led them to the most extreme acts; had any of these been elected to the Papal chair, the least which could have been looked for, would have been a withdrawal of communion from "the heretics." Nor was it in the time of Bossuet, an opinion then first brought into notice,—it was more than two centuries previous to the famous Gallican declaration which caused all this violent writing, that the Councils of Constance and Basil had proclaimed the

* Palmer's Trêatise, vol. i., p. 96.

superiority of a council over the Pope.—Time, therefore, had not made it a matter of calm dispute; it was debated as violently as ever; and we may, therefore, well believe, that should any circumstance again call particular attention to this point and renew the debate, it would arouse feelings of no less anger; and with a Pontiff in the chair of St. Peter, such as was St. Stephen, in days of old, the "practical inconvenience" would prove to be something more than slight, to those who valued, at the same time, their own opinions and the communion of Rome. However, it is not only that what has occurred before, may occur again, with even greater violence; but the very principle of universal obedience to a fallible authority, is pregnant with danger; heretics have ere now filled the Papal chair. Liberius signed an Arian Creed, admitting the Arians to his communion. Honorius was even condemned for Monothelism by a general council. What is to prevent heresy from again sitting in the Roman throne? Yet, if it be there, according to the present Papal theory, it is to be obeyed.*—Orthodox Bishops would be deposed and excommunicated; heretical ones raised up and acknowledged; for it is hardly to be supposed, that the Pope would not endeavour to enforce conformity to his own faith, or that he would not make use of so great a power when acknowledged to belong to him; and were he a man of great energy, and of a long rule, he might so depress the orthodox as to ensure the filling of the Papal chair by heretics for no short time. What

* Bellarmine carries this to its extreme, and actually affirms that "if the Pope should so far err as to command vices, and prohibit virtues, the Church would be bound to believe that vices are good, and virtues are evil; unless she will sin against her conscience." De Pontif. iv., 5, quoted by Dr. Wordsworth in his Letters on the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome.

then is the consequence of all this? that the maintainers of the truth, and of the purity of the faith, are cut off from the Church, and by consequence, from salvation, because cut off from the communion of Rome; that the whole Church would be over-run with heresy, and the true light scarcely shine; and that the Church would be placed in the greatest danger, and be brought to the extreme of weakness. Yet we are told, that a system, pregnant with such consequences as these, is necessary to preservation of the faith and of Christian unity; and that the fallibility or infallibility of the Pope is a question, not involving any practical inconvenience. To say that this never has been the case is vain, for that is no guarantee that it never will be; or to say, that in such a case there would be many who would not obey, is equally vain, for this would admit the lawfulness of non-obedience, which is denied; and to say, that a general council could rectify all the evil, is as little to the purpose; for the Pope would not admit the authority of the council over his own, (that is one of the disputed points;) moreover, if he found things likely to go contrary to his will, he would dissolve it, or translate it, as Eugenius IV. endeavoured to do with the Synod of Basil. In fact, it appears difficult to see, what difference it practically can make, which opinion is held concerning the Papal infallibility, if it be allowed that the Pope must be obeyed; but it is not difficult to see, that fearful evil may arise to the Church from universal obedience to a fallible authority, and that the question has been already, and may be, to a much greater extent, productive of the most serious "practical inconvenience." Moreover, let it be added with regard to the remedy provided by a general council, that even if the

Pope permitted its sittings, the result might be uncertain, as Romanists are themselves divided on the point as to what constitutes a general council; and some admit the authority of councils, whose authority others as strongly deny; as, for instance, the Synod of Constance in 1414; that of Basil in 1431; that of Florence in 1437; and the fifth Lateran in 1512. So that really there is no certain remedy, even according to the theories of Romish Theologians. The only safeguard is the promise of Christ, and the presence of the spirit of truth; but this needs not the aid of a fallible centre of unity; the latter we deny as belonging to the Church, and believe that we should be better without it; the former we admit as the very essence of the Church, and her surety that she can never fail. Discarding the Papal theory altogether, we may sit unconcerned at what we regard as a trifling and unimportant discussion; but how, if the Romish theory be adopted, this question can be otherwise than fundamental, it is not so easy to see; in fact it then becomes a kind of turning point of Christianity, and a criterion of truth; for if a heresy is to be anathematized, yet the Pope be not known, whether fallible or infallible, and a general council be not known, as to what is essential to make its decrees binding, there really remains no certain test, no final appeal; and the resource only left is, to receive those whom Rome receives, and to reject those whom she rejects; in a word, to regard her as infallible; notwithstanding the disputed point, and the fact, of heretical Popes having existed; and of the early Church not having paid such blind submission.

With regard to the Jansenist disputes, they are hardly so easily to be got over, as Mr. Northcote thinks. In

the first place, they were not like the Homoöusian, or Nestorian, or Eutychian controversies; because they were revivals of a heresy condemned before; "Jansenius sought to revive a heresy which had been already condemned:" in the next place, after its denunciation, it existed openly in the pale of the Roman Church; Jansenists were in her communion; and the Pope was obliged to tolerate them, nothwithstanding the Bulls sent forth at various times. These points deserve some consideration; for Jansenism is far from being dead; the spirit which it called forth still lives in the Church of Rome, and has called for the special animadversion of the present Pope, in his Encyclical Letter, just published; as well as of Gregory XVI.

Jansenius was Bishop of Ypres, and published a book called Augustinus; after his death the Jesuits found five propositions, partaking of Calvinism, which they denounced to the Pope. Innocent X., by a Bull, A.D. 1653, condemned them; but an appeal was made on the ground that the sense of the words of Jansenius had been misrepresented. Nevertheless, A.D. 1666, Alexander VII., again condemned the book, on the ground that the sense had not been mistaken. Many of the French Clergy maintaining, (not that Jansenius' condemned opinions were true, but) that his words meant differently from the sense assigned, refused to recognise the Bull; and these men were called Jansenists; and later, "Appellants:" the main principle of Jansenism was, not the Calvinism imputed to Jansenius, but a spirit of reform. Its supporters attacked the discipline and morality of the Church of Rome more particularly, yet also maintained a teaching stigmatized by their adversaries as heretical: they taught the superiority of mental

to ceremonial devotion, urged on general education, strove to increase the knowledge of the Scriptures, and many such things of which the Church of Rome disapproved. After the appearance of Pope Alexander's Bull, a formulary was drawn up in conformity with it, which all the Clergy were required to sign. This was refused by many, Bishops as well as Priests; and at all events, numbers signed, proclaiming nevertheless, that they did not change their sentiments. Thus matters went on. Clement IX., and Innocent XI., behaved with great moderation; but the work of Quesnel revived the dispute with redoubled violence, and Clement XI. sent forth against his book, A.D. 1713, the Bull "Unigenitus." And now arose the strongest opposition to the See of Rome, an opposition which not even the Royal power of France, united with the Papal, could subdue. The Bull was appealed against; Bishops refused to publish it; some even opposed it; and these not a few; amongst whom was Cardinal Noailles himself, the Archbishop of Paris. Universities; Ecclesiastics innumerable; Laymen; all set themselves in opposition to this Bull; disobeyed the Pope; supported the Jansenists; and yet remained in their Sees and their duties, and in full communion with their Church; and for years Jansenism reigned triumphant, in full power and (notwithstanding its condemnation and its opposition to the Pope,) in full communion in the French Church. At length after more than a century's duration, its power declined, but it did not die, and its spirit displayed itself even in the end of the eighteenth century, in taking the oath to the constitution of 1791. But France was not the only seat of Jansenism. It spread throughout the Roman Church, to Italy itself, "reducing to

nothing the principal chair, the centre of unity," and showing "contemptuous hostility to the Council of Trent," yet nevertheless admitted to the communion of the Church. Bishops published instructions against images, and taught that the worship of Saints was unnecessary, annulled their own dependence on the Pope, denied the obligation of his Bulls, or the necessity of an oath of obedience to him; in a word, discipline and doctrine were alike attacked, and the Pope remonstrated to no effect; matters went on still the same; and a professor of Vienna, who wrote against auricular confession, and was condemned by Pius VI. as heretical, yet remained in the open communion of the Church; and this nearly a century and a half after Jansenism first appeared. Nowhere, perhaps, did this spirit more strongly manifest itself, than in the dominions of Joseph II. of Austria. He suppressed convents, "forbade pilgrimages and processions, prohibited the pomp of funeral ceremonies, declared marriage to be a purely civil contract, forbade all Papal Bulls to be published throughout his dominions without the permission of the government, abolished the privileges of the university of Louvain, and established a new Theological Seminary in its place;" he even interfered with the religious services, removed images, suppressed sees; and, notwithstanding the Pope's journeying to Vienna to complain and remonstrate, he yielded not, but continued on in his former course; a far more sweeping reformer than was Henry VIII. of England, and yet remaining in the bosom of the Roman Church, with no pretence on her part to cast him out. Neither are all these mere assertions of a theological controversialist; they are to be found in pages, which only allude to theological disputes

as matters of history, and are supported by the complaints of the advocates of Rome herself. There was equal reason for casting out Joseph II. from the Church, that there was for casting out any of the Sovereigns of England; for never was the authority of Rome and the Council of Trent more set at nought than by that reforming Emperor; but Austria was too close to Rome, and the Papal power had learnt bitterly from experience, that excommunication was impolitic and would not avail; and therefore it submitted in the close of the eighteenth century to that which in the sixteenth century it refused to hear of. Such then was the spirit of Jansenism; condemned and opposed by the Popes, in open opposition to the Papal power and the decrees of Trent; yet upheld by Bishops and Sovereigns, Ecclesiastics and Laymen, who, nevertheless, were cast not out of the Church, but retained their sees and their benefices, and were admitted to Communion; a spirit which still lives within that same Church, and lives openly and energetically enough to call forth the warning and disapproval of the late and present Pontiff. Yet we are told that heresy lives not within the pale of the Roman Church, that as soon as it appears it is cast forth, whilst she speaks everywhere with one voice, a pattern of unity.

Attention has been called by Mr. Northcote to the vague and uncertain teaching of our Church, and the unmeaningness of her articles, and the consequent differences of teaching within her, yet all laying claim to her authority. Supposing all this were true the Church of Rome is open to the same charge. Concerning images the Council of Trent decrees that "the images of Christ, and of the Virgin Mother of God and of the other Saints are to be preserved in Churches,

and that due honour and veneration are to be paid to them,"* yet to what amount this due honour extends is uncertain; there are indeed certain restrictions, but they are as vague as the words restricted, and the consequence is an extreme variety in Roman teaching. Bossuet says, "When the Church pays an honour to the image of an Apostle or Martyr, her intention is not so much to honour the image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the image." The vindicator of his "exposition" says, "we do not attribute to them any virtue, but that of exciting in us the remembrance of those they represent;" "these exterior signs (of gratitude) are not paid to the image, but to Jesus Christ, represented by that image;" "the use we make of pictures or images, is purely as representations," exactly similar to this is the teaching of a work written long since, called "The Papist misrepresented and represented." Dr. Baines in his Sermon, preached at Bradford, after mentioning images, in which he includes the Cross, says "Anathema to the man who worships an image as God, or gives to it Divine honours, or believes it to possess any Divine power or virtue, or prays to it, or believes it to be anything more than a lifeless, senseless, lump of matter." Exactly similar to this, is the teaching of a small catechism, much used in Madras; and a catena may be formed of Divines and high authorities in the Romish Church, who teach in this manner; a manner, which certainly appears to be in accordance with the limitations and meaning of the Council of Trent. But very different views may be found, set forth and maintained by men of great note and high authority in the Church

* Sessio xxv.

of Rome. Bellarmine, concerning images, says, "the images of Christ and of the Saints are to be venerated, not only accidentally or improperly, but by themselves and properly (proprie), so that they themselves should terminate the worship, as considered in themselves, and not only as bearing a representative character:" words which seem to speak rather against the teaching of the Council of Trent. Cardinal Capisucchi seems to steer a middle course, refusing to images a worship on their own account, or, as he calls it, an "idolatrous worship," but allowing that they may be honoured with divine worship (Latriâ) on account of what they represent, even the image of the Cross; and he declares this to be the teaching of the Councils of Nicæa and Trent. In the Romish pontifical we may find the following, "if a legate of the Holy See receive an emperor, or enter the city with him, &c., the emperor's sword-bearer, and the legate's cross-bearer should go together; the cross of the legate on the right, because divine worship is due to it." Again, take the service for the "benediction of a New Cross;" in which adoration is paid to it more than once, and a prayer is made, that by its merits, ("hujus crucis merito") the souls of the offerers may be freed from all sins. If we turn to the missal in the services for Good Friday, we find this same adoration; the priest takes off his shoes, and "approaches to adore the Cross" (accedit ad adorandam crucem). We hear these things explained away by Romish apologists; when such objections are made, the charge of idolatory is indignantly repelled; explanations are offered, which seem strained even to explain away the words of their hymns, wherein confessedly as being poetry, more license may be allowed; but in the prose part of their services, such explanations

become far more difficult, and look much more strained; yet explain them away they must, or they lay themselves open to the charge of idolatry so often brought against them. Now I am not pretending to accuse members of the Church of Rome of idolatry; with this my present purpose has nothing to do; all I desire is to shew that, first, the Council of Trent speaks so ambiguously as to admit of the most contradictory doctrines being founded on its decrees; and that, therefore, Romanists have no right to urge against us any ambiguity or latitudinarianism in our formularies: secondly, that they do not hesitate to explain away, when necessary, the first and most obvious meaning of their services, in order to maintain doctrines to which those services seem plainly opposed; and that therefore they are the last, who should urge as a testimony against our Church, that she allows teachers to remain within her, who treat her services in the same manner. The matter then stands thus; the Council of Trent decrees some honour, but limits it. Bossuet, in a work sanctioned by the Bishops of France, and approved by the Pope, gives as little honour as possible to the images of whatsoever kind, indeed scarcely any, and declares that they are to be regarded solely as memorials. Dr. Baines launches an anathema at those who teach differently. Cardinal Capisucchi allows them divine worship, but on account of what they represent. Bellarmine insists that they are to be venerated, in, and for themselves, and not as mere representatives, whilst the Missal and Pontificial decree adoration and divine worship to the Cross. The council has spoken with equal latitude and ambiguity concerning relics; the word veneration there used being able to mean anything, from the mere "honour," allowed

them by Bossuet, to the "adoration," claimed for them by Vasquez. Again, with regard to Saints, suppliant invocation to them is enjoined by the council;* which, Bossuet says, means no more than as if we asked the prayers of our friends on earth in our behalf. And so Dr. Baines again says: "Anathema to the man who worships the Saints as Gods, attributes to them any divine power, believes them to be any more than mere creatures, wholly dependant upon God for every blessing which they possess themselves, or obtain for others, who prays to them with any other view than that of obtaining their prayers, and as one creature may lawfully pray to another, &c." Now, if we turn to the "Office of the Blessed Virgin" in the Romish Liturgy, we shall there find prayers, which need no slight explanation to persuade those who read them, that they are not prayers such as may be offered to the Deity alone; before this can be done, a non-natural sense must be violently imposed upon the terms used, and words supplied according to the necessity of the case. However, all have not felt this difficulty; and Crasset, in a work, approved by the Society of Jesuits, and published by permission, asserts that the Virgin is "omnipotent," and has "authority to command her son," and that it is necessary to pray to her to be saved by her intercession; and this teaching seems to be in full accordance with the late Pope's Encyclical Letter, with the Abbè Gaume's Catechism, and is received by Mr. Newman. Similar are the differences concerning merits; Bossuet and his school as usual allowing but little to man; the Romish services allowing much to the Saints; Maldonatus, Bellarmine, Vasquez, declaring expressly that our own works of

* Sessio 25.

themselves merit, independently of God's covenant; the latter declaring that our good works need no imputation of Christ's righteousness for salvation; yet all these again profess to teach the doctrine of the Council of Trent. Similar is the wide discrepancy on the doctrine of satisfaction; but we may pass these by, and say only a few words on the doctrine of the Mass. The Council of Trent defines the Mass to be "a true and proper sacrifice!" Bellarmine* on this, argues that such a sacrifice requires the true and real death or destruction of the offering; and, maintaining that Christ is wholly present with all accidents, he asserts that there must be "a real and true killing and slaying of Christ," and that He is not merely presented before God on the altar, but really and truly sacrificed; an opinion, which in truth the words of the Council of Trent seem absolutely to demand, for otherwise the words, a "true and proper sacrifice," really have no meaning. On the other hand, Dr. Baines asserts that Christ is not present "in a crude and mortal state;" Bossuet and the author of the "Papist Misrepresented, &c.," maintain a doctrine which seems but little removed from Anglican teaching, is *rejected* by Bellarmine, and certainly is hardly reconcileable with the Tridentine canon, if those words really mean anything. What then is the case? We have open questions of the most vital kind, regarded as matters of faith, producing the most violent contentions, and really involving the most serious and important consequences. We have Tridentine decrees so ambiguous, that the widest and most opposite doctrines are maintained on their authority. We have liturgies, which require to be explained away, and to

* De Missâ. Lib. i., cap. 27.

have their expressions modified and softened down. We have other canons of Trent, which seem to speak plainly enough, which nevertheless are made the foundation of teaching the most widely different, and we have the history of a heresy, raging violently for more than a century, and not yet dead, opposing the discipline and doctrine of the Church of Rome, and setting at nought the authority of the Pope; yet upheld by her Bishops, and admitted to full communion with the orthodox members of the Church. Nevertheless we are to believe that Rome has but one voice, that her teaching is uniform, and that her differences are merely speculative, and productive of no practical inconvenience. This is rather much to believe, and we must still doubt the vaunted unity of Rome, and declare, that if such internal unity be essential to the Church as Mr. Northcote would fain require from the Anglican, then the Church must have ceased to exist.

It is to no purpose that attention is called to the present tranquil state of that Church, and her apparent unity contrasted with our dissension,—it is very doubtful whether this unity is deeper than the surface, nay, the very warnings and animadversions of the present Pope proclaim the existence and life of the troubling spirit within her; it scarcely sleeps, much less is dead; and the antagonist principles which have so torn her, which still dwell in her, may yet be again aroused and fill her full of strife. We may well believe that her present unity is the result of deep policy, and of anxious watching of the progress of events. In England more especially, she wears her best dress; here her strifes are not whispered; she has her way to make, and knows full well that rumours of disunion within, would keep

numbers from dreaming of joining her communion; she feels the necessity of concealing all the evil, and setting forward all the good; she teaches nothing which might offend or startle; she is an adept in the art of making herself "all things to all men." Hence, if strifes arise within her, they will not be allowed to reach England; or, if they come hither, their report is smothered and concealed. Yet, grant that she is at peace within herself, that no strifes agitate her; still what is to be done with these widely different modes of explaining her doctrines? She still has, what she has ever had since the Council of Trent, two antagonist principles, which must prevent her unity from being real. But above all, she cannot do away the past; the long struggle of Jansenism within her, which she denounced, and yet was obliged to tolerate, must ever remain as a witness against her claim, and overthrow her boast of an unviolated discipline. Better is it to confess, like the English Church, that her hands are tied, so that she cannot speak and act as she could wish, than to vaunt like the Church of Rome, a strictness and an inflexibility, which circumstances have shewn she is obliged to yield up.

It might, I think, be shewn, that the English Church is not so utterly devoid of power, as her enemies assert, and very much more might be said on this whole question; what has been said is but a mere sketch, but surely sufficient to throw back upon Rome her attack upon the English Church. Far be it from any of us, to exult in the disunion of the Church of Rome, or her troubles; she is still our sister, though in error; and therefore do we mourn over both her troubles and our own, because she belongs to Christ, as well as ourselves; yet keep aloof from her we still must, until her

theory is changed, and her faith purified; meantime it is vain to draw comparisons between the two communions; and though it be one of the notes of the Church, yet unity can never be made a test between us, until some agreement shall exist, as to what true unity is. Our theory must be overthrown before we can embrace the Roman.

I must before leaving this part of the subject, again protest against the unfairness of some arguments employed by Mr. Northcote. We should no more than himself deny the fatal consequences of apostacy; we should, when told of the fatal wanderings of an apostate, at once exclaim, that it is what might have been expected. The schismatic from any branch of the Church has no safeguard against falling; the inference, therefore, which he draws from their lives in the 37th page of his pamphlet, is as little to the purpose as need be. Again, his accusation of latent heresy in the English Church, is no more than is brought constantly against his own. Once more; he objects to the phrases of infusing such and such a spirit into our Church; but he uses the words "into the Church;" and argues the question, just as if we regarded our Church as the whole Church, the infallible guide to truth; whereas we do no such thing, we claim not for her, perfection; we say not that she may not have rejected, from various circumstances, things which nevertheless may be beneficial; "the reformers were but frail fallible men," said the Bishop of Oxford, in his charge some few years ago, "compassed about with many infirmities, sometimes halting between two opinions, and sometimes of course erring in judgment, still we are their debtors to an incalculable amount, and if perhaps we have lost some little through

them, or rather in spite of their wishes to the contrary, we have lost far less than our sins deserve; we have even now, through their instrumentality, more blessings within our reach, than we care to avail ourselves of; and if we were not deficient in humility, we should be so grateful for what they have done, that we might almost, perhaps, begin to hope that in his good time, God would make up to us, what we have hitherto been without." We do however say, that she can lead her children to salvation, and in her we have all confidence. Moreover what is meant by infusing a spirit into her, but a desire of awakening her members, and rousing them up to follow her teaching in its fulness; and of bringing forward parts of her own teaching, which a slothful and faithless age had allowed to sink almost into oblivion? It is sad to witness the manner in which accusations are made against the English Church, by the schismatics from her communion, which themselves, whilst belonging to her, would never for a moment have admitted to be true, but which would on the contrary, have excited their wonder and astonishment. If Rome changes not the whole moral nature, she certainly seems to change the eye of the judgment, so that what yesterday appeared undoubtedly white, should to-day seem as undoubtedly black. Arguments, which as members of the English Church, they would have at once repudiated, and felt to be groundless, they use themselves, so soon as they are separated from her. I say not that they intentionally misrepresent, for I believe them to be men of too high minded a nature, to wilfully stoop to such means; but they seem to be blinded by their new-born zeal, and in their eagerness to make out a case for Rome, to use arguments, which, if considered, would

have been rejected. Yet they are dangerous, because they wear a specious appearance of truth.

I pass to the consideration of Mr. Northcote's next point, viz., Sanctity; and this will suit even less, as a test, between the two Churches, than unity. We have a definition, or rather, description given to us of sanctity, in sufficiently glowing colours, and enthusiastic terms. It is a test on which I have no intention of dwelling for any time, because nothing can well be proved from it. We believe the Church to be Holy, because full of the Holy Spirit, and. of holy teaching, which produce holiness in her members; but it becomes a question as to whether this holiness is more correctly to be understood of the whole body, which is thus called holy, or of some few members which belong to it. If the former be the more true idea of holiness (and at all events, it must very largely enter into the idea), we need not hesitate to affirm the infinite superiority of general holiness produced in the Anglican, over the Roman communion: if individual holiness be the truer notion, even then we do not shrink from the comparison; but we claim the liberty of disputing Mr. Northcote's notion of sanctity, and of maintaining the possession of characters as really holy, though perhaps not so splendidly so,* as there have been in the Church of Rome. Next it becomes worth considering, whether the English Church herself might not produce far more, and far greater examples of sanctity, such as even Rome must acknowledge, if her full spirit were carried into practice. Next, even supposing the superior sanctity of Rome

* I do not so readily admit the sanctity of Ignatius Loyola, as Mr. Northcote does. The author of the Rules of the Society of Jesus cannot possess undisputed sanctity.

should be admitted, what can it possibly prove more than that she possesses a better discipline, or other means of holiness, which we have lost? it surely can by no means prove that the English Church is not holy also, albeit in a lower degree; and if she possesses the means of holiness in *any* degree, no *superior* holiness elsewhere can clear us of the guilt of schism in deserting her. Further, it is not fair to compare the tone produced in conversation, &c., by the respective Churches in England; because Rome being engaged in a struggle, her children would naturally think and speak much on these points, and their constant thoughts would tinge their conversation. The Anglican Church, on the contrary, has slept in security, and until lately has felt but comparatively slight alarm. The numbers also are so disproportionate, composing the two, that in this country one would scarce expect to find amongst the adherents of Rome such a mass of persons, careless about religion, as must exist in the dominant religion of the land. However I must say that my own experience of Romanists would not place the tone of their conversation above that of Anglicans; I could never have discerned the difference; there must be in both communions many who pay little regard to what is passing; and of those who do pay much regard, it may be a reasonable matter of doubt, whether the thoughts aroused tinge the conversation of a Romanist more than of a member of the English Church. But to compare with fairness the effect of the two religions in this manner, the Anglican tone should be compared with the tone observable in lands where Romanism reigns triumphant, where the Romish Church holds the same position which our own does in England; for the feelings will always naturally

be more conspicuously shewn, because more strongly and incessantly felt, in those anxious and striving to gain a position, than in those who have long enjoyed it in security; at least until the latter become fully sensible of imminent danger. Once more, it must be borne in mind that Rome claims exclusive sanctity to the exclusion of all other churches; it is therefore sufficient in arguing against her claim, to shew that any Church out of her communion possesses this note; because she considers we have lost it by losing her communion; and therefore if any Church not in communion with her, yet possesses sanctity, it is sufficient proof that neither need we be joined to her in order to possess it. Now it is a fact that the Greek Church claims, equally with the Roman, all which the latter most values; the same Monastic institutions; the same, nay even more rigid, rules; amid all her depression she asserts the existence of high and noted saints, and of miracles within her communion; there is no evidence of sanctity which Rome would bring forward, to which the Greek Church would not also lay claim, and, for any thing we can see, with equal right. What then becomes of the Romish exclusive sanctity, and this note of her communion being the sole Church of Christ? The "Bread of Life" must equally belong to the Eastern Church, and not be confined to Rome: moreover the very existence of that Church, trampled upon as she has been by her sisters of the West, and by the Pagans around her, is a marvel; and still more marvellous is it, when we find the life which she has been enabled to maintain and put forth under such heavy trials. The Russian Church stands a firm unwavering witness in her favour; in all points is she armed, and we are told that her institutions are not

disgraced by that laxity and immorality, which, notwithstanding her professed strictness, find place too often in the Monasteries of the Church of Rome. Are not these things evidences in her favour against the arrogant claims of Rome? And it has been well said of late, that whatsoever will prove the position of the Greek Church to be tenable, will prove our own the same. But need we go beyond our own Church for evidences of life? Stayed by the hand of Providence at the Reformation, persecuted by Queen Mary, yet delivered by her death, apparently trampled in the dust by the Puritan Rebellion, yet rising up once more in full vigour, vainly plotted against by conspirators in the reign of one Monarch, and by a Popish King in another, hated and depressed by a Puritan Sovereign, whose hand nevertheless was powerless to destroy her, she still survived. Infidelity and apathy have successively attacked her; and yet she still lives, putting forth in these days a fresh and vigorous life, such as, humanly speaking, we could have never hoped to see again. Her principles are becoming better understood, her power is again increasing. Threatened with destruction some ten or twelve years since, she now makes her voice heard; evil which had been done seems likely to be repaired: and even those who spoke most loudly against her, now speak of the increase of her episcopate and of her power. A zeal and an earnestness is aroused within her: we find her priesthood diligent and careful; few of those could now be found, who, no many years since, were a scandal to their office: practical piety is rapidly increasing both amongst her clergy and her laity: her Bishops are men of greater energy and deeper principle; in a word, notwithstanding her divisions, she has of late put forth such

evidences of life, as it would be difficult to believe produced by mere human power, unaided by the spirit of God: a life beginning not in the Church of Rome, but raised up in the communion of the English Church whilst Rome was slumbering. Mr. Northcote, however, attacks our Church for the motives through which her members are excited to acts of love and mercy. Yet those who look carefully may find unworthy means resorted to, even in this country, by Romanists, before they can obtain what is required for their various purposes of good. Appeals to unworthy principles are not confined to members of the English Church; and I deny the want of proper principles and feelings with which Mr. Northcote charges us; for a spirit newly-aroused, in a country so much immersed in business as England, wonders have been effected. It is seldom that appeals are made in vain. Noble-minded individuals have stepped forward and laid their substance at the feet of their Church. Churches in numbers are arising in every quarter, built in a manner worthy of a House of God; and often founded and endowed by faithful sons of the Church, whose names in many instances remain unknown. Colleges for the training of her Missionaries are rising up, reared by the charitable hand of some of her liberal-minded children: in a word, we find a vast amount of wealth, daily increasing, laid by charitable hands at the Church's feet for her disposal. Nor are there wanting numbers of her children willing to give themselves, as well as their substance, and to be spent in her service. Not her priests alone are zealous, indefatigable, and devoted, in too many instances to the destruction of health, and the weakening of all bodily powers; but numbers of laity may everywhere be met with, actuated by charity and

zeal. I need not pass beyond the bounds of this very city for a proof of this. I speak not of those, much of whose time is given to public charities, and to the relief of the sick; but there are found those, whose whole time is thus spent, whose whole thoughts seem devoted to works of mercy; whose days are spent in no other employment, who wander through the abodes of sickness and of want, searching out and relieving the "desolate and oppressed." That even thus, much misery must remain unrelieved, much sorrow uncomforted, cannot be denied: but this must ever be the case, and England need not shrink in this respect from a comparison with Romish lands. It is true we have no orders bound by their vows to works of mercy, but there is a spirit abroad amongst us, whatever may be said to the contrary, equally binding on the conscience, equally productive of brotherly love and mercy, with any irrevocable vow. It works silently and secretly, as true charity will ever work, yet it works with zeal, awakened when the Church awoke from her lethargy, and increasing in strength, according as her zeal increased and spread itself abroad. Nor is it true that our altars are deserted by the poor. In some places this may be indeed the case; but so far as I have seen, the very contrary has been the case, especially in country places. There are numberless places where the poor may be seen crowding to the altar whensoever the Blessed Sacrament is offered for the health of their souls; and this is especially observable, wherever the true principles of the Anglican Church are most carried out, and most earnestly inculcated by the Pastor of his flock. Nay, and there may be found amongst the poor, those who love well their Church and her institutions; who are faithful to her voice, and wait

upon her commands, and of whom, if man may dare to pronounce of man, it may be well said, that their end will be peace. That dissent should have spread widely amongst them, need surely be no cause of wonder, when we reflect upon the coldness which so long kept the English Church torpid, indifferent to the souls entrusted to her charge, and careless whether they were taught and guided in her paths, or whether they wandered from her fold. It is no more than a judgment which might have been expected, against her carelessness, and a warning to awake her from her lethargy. It is the fault not of her system, but of the indifference and coldness of those who allowed her system to be forgotten, and her principles to be buried. Hence she found, on awaking, an evil spirit already abroad and making way, and she has to destroy an influence, which was long since widely spread. Moreover dissent appeals exclusively to the feelings, inveighs against imagined grievances in the Church, making for its groundwork those real grievances occasioned by past neglect; it appeals to these, and excites the passions, and works upon them when excited; it catches the ignorant and uninformed, who are ever ready to believe in wrongs, and to desire the overthrow of authority; and one secret of its success has been more than once openly avowed by those, who are led away by it; it makes religion easy, a mere matter of excited and passing feeling, a system of bare belief, needing nothing of practice to salvation. These are much more truly the causes of its success, than any want of sympathy and holy spirit in the Anglican Church; and wherever the revival of true Church principles has been most earnestly, and at the same time judiciously impressed and urged, there has dissent found an insur-

mountable barrier, and there has its progress been arrested. Where exceptions to this have occurred, it will be found that an over zealous mind has endeavoured to hastily thrust profitable, but unessential things upon those not duly prepared to receive them. It is unfair to charge upon the English Church evils, which are the result, not of her system and teaching, but of the neglect and perversion of these.

That there is a real difference between the systems of the two Churches, is not, I suppose, to be denied; but that there is any real superiority in the Roman over the Anglican, if they are fully carried out, is of course, not admitted for a moment. Take the point of confession for instance, as Mr. Northcote has himself brought it forward. Albeit the practice of auricular confession is contrary to the practice of the Primitive Church,* yet

* That my words may not be misunderstood, and thus give ground for a new cavil, I will add the few following remarks in explanation.

The Ancient Church had a strict discipline requiring all notorious offenders to be put out of communion, to perform penance, then to confess publicly their sins before the whole Church in shape of a prayer to God, after which they were prayed for by the Church, and then by imposition of the Bishop's hands restored to communion. Those whose sins were secret, out of piety used sometimes to voluntarily undergo this discipline, having recourse first of all it may be to some discreet presbyter, who might advise them as to what should be done; but his duty was only to advise and console. Therefore this private confession was solely with a view to gaining advice and guidance, and totally different in kind from both ancient public and the modern Roman auricular confession. In process of time the voluntary public confession was done away, first in the Greek, afterwards in the Latin Church; and a public Penitentiary was appointed in each diocese to receive the private confessions, and to impose penance in those cases which before had been confessed, and cured publicly. His office was not to receive confession of slight offences, they were poured forth only to God in secret. At length in the Greek Church even the public Penitentiary's office was done away, and offenders were solely left to their own conscience; of course they could consult pastors in whom they had confidence, should they so desire; but it was no part of the discipline of their Church. In the Latin Church these private confessions were at last made compulsory once a year to a priest, by the 4th Lateran Council, A. D. 1215. After which auricular confession began to be regarded as a Sacrament. Thus we see that the modern Roman doctrine differs from the ancient in several points. In the first place the reconciliation was public by the Bishop, not private by the

this is not the present question, and I pass it by, intending only to regard the effects of the two systems. The Anglican Church requires public confession, and pronounces public absolution, yet she does not hinder thereby, but it may be private; on the contrary, she persuades to the "opening of grief," those who cannot "quiet their consciences," so that they "may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice;" and this she does, so often as her Priests read the invitation to the holy communion; that is three times a year at the least, and according to the perfection of her theory, once a week, or even oftener. She admits of private confession, she advises it in certain cases, but she does not make it compulsory. "The Church of England is in no way engaged against it," says Bishop Taylor, "but advises it and practises it."* "Our quarrel is not with confession itself," says Bishop Hall,† "which may be of singular use and behoof; but with some tyrannous strains in the practice of it." On the

Priest who received the confession: next it was only for serious crimes, not for all sins, which were confessed to God alone: next the penance preceded the reconciliation, and reconciliation was not given as soon as the sin was poured into the priest's ears: above all, it was a matter of discipline, but not regarded as a sacramental rite. Auricular confession, as a point of discipline, was unknown in the Western Church until the days of Leo; and then, though substituted for public, was only with a view to guidance, the imposition of penance, the aid of others' prayers, and reconciliation after grievous crimes. Hence we seem to gain a key to the intention of our own Church, who seeks to conform herself so far as she can to the primitive model. Advising in all doubt and distress of conscience that counsel and comfort should be sought at the priest's lips, and admitting fully his power to absolve, she seems at the same time to recommend private confession, with a view to absolution, only when "the conscience is troubled with any weighty matter," such to wit as those for which the Ancient Church exacted that severe course of discipline, that sad and public confession of grievous sin. Our Church scarcely seems to advise confession with a view to absolution as a periodical ordinary practice, but only on weighty occasions, leaving the less grievous offences to be supplicated for in private to our God. (See Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Book vi., where the subject is fully treated of.)

* Dissuasive from Popery, Section xi. † The Old Religion, xiii., 2.

other hand, the Church of Rome makes it essential to salvation, that it be practised at least once a year, and always before communion.* Now what can be the use of it, according to the Roman theory of confessing all sins, if it be used only once a year? The confession must necessarily be very imperfect, and those, who thus use it, troubled in mind, lest in so long a space they may have forgotten some sin, and thereby forfeit the benefit of absolution. But, I suppose, no really pious member of their Church would delay it for so long a a time, partly for the difficulty thereby occasioned, and partly because it would keep him so long from the "Bread of Life;" and those, who are not really pious, but superstitious, would come oftener for another reason; viz., that their consciences might be relieved of a heavy burden. We hear, and have heard much of the abuses of the confessional, and of the opportunity which it gives for sin; an accusation, which, there is much reason to fear, has not been made without good reason, and warranty of facts. Again its system of questioning bears a very doubtful character, as being often the mode of suggesting to pure and innocent minds, thoughts and desires which otherwise would never have had place in them, thus giving a knowledge of sin, which existed not before. Further, it seems calculated to produce a carelessness and a disregard of sin, and a callousness in the heart; because the shame attendant on it, may soon pass from the mind; the mind will become accustomed to it, lose its sense of shame, gradually think less of those sins, which are so constantly proclaimed; and all will be regarded as a mere form. To some minds, of course, the contrary will be the case, and it may be a blessing to

* 4th Lat. Conc. Can., xxi. Conc. Trid. Sess., xiv., 6, 7.

the truly penitent sinner; but with an unworthy or injudicious confessor, or to a careless mind, or to a pure and innocent soul, the system appears fraught with danger of a most fearful kind; a very teaching, and encouragement of sin. Now from all this the Church of England is free, because she does not compel it; whilst she retains its advantages, inasmuch as the overburdened soul may be lightened of its weight. She teaches no sin unknown before, she is not in danger of bringing over the soul a carelessness and indifference; in her communion it can never be regarded as a mere form, never be considered as otherwise than a most solemn act, because it is only the soul, oppressed with a sense of guilt, which would have recourse to it; only the truly penitent would use it; and then it would retain every advantage of the Roman system, freed at the same time from its dangers. The lenten fast moreover, is not more severe in the Roman than the English Church, when properly observed as she commands; and numbers there are who observe it in all its strictness. Neither here do I believe that she is less strict than the Roman. Certainly the practice has much fallen into disuse amongst us, through negligence and apathy; but the command of the Church still remains; and we hold those, who know the Church's rule, and disobey it, to be guilty of that disobedience, and liable to all its consequences, equally as if they were publicly kept from her communion; excuse being made for this disobedience, on the ground of blindness, the consequence of prejudice and a faulty and imperfect education. But there is one point, wherein the Anglican rule is stricter than the Roman, and that is, the frequency of communion. The Church of Rome is satisfied with communicating once

in the year;* the Church of England requires it three times in the year at least.† She cannot, it is true, in these evil days enforce her decrees, because her hands are bound; yet, nevertheless, the moral obligation of obedience remains, an obligation which no temporal law can dissolve; for children of the Church are bound to obey her commands out of duty and love, and not out of fear. She may be unable to punish the disobedient, yet are they not the less guilty; and she is not chargeable with this inability, for it comes not of herself. And here I would remark, that we may well attribute to our neglect of that frequent communion, intended by the Anglican Church, the want of sanctity which we find: did we communicate with that frequency, which the spirit of our Church enjoins, we might well hope for better things.

With regard to Monasteries, we confess our non-possession, but we are not so ready to confess our want. Undoubtedly they have their advantages, but they have their disdavantages also, and are liable to corruption, and they have been fruitful sources of disunion in the Church. How they may grow corrupt, the history of our own Reformation will testify; and Mr. Palmer, in his "Treatise," has shown that this corruption did not decrease in lands where they were retained. It was but a short time since, that a notice appeared of the visitation of a Monastery by a Romish Archbishop in Prussia, when the Institution was found to be in a gross state of laxity and luxury, the abolishing of which caused a partial breaking up of the establishment. But independent of all this liability to corruption, the strong Anti-Roman

* Concil. Trid Sessio, xiii. 9.

† Rubric at the end of the Communion Office.

feeling which pervades England would render the erection of Monastic Institutions a matter of the greatest difficulty, even should it be attempted. Perhaps moreover the genius of the English Church tends not that way; for whereas Rome seems to draw forth some one virtue, and to give it its full scope, the Anglican Church rather seeks to produce a fusion of virtues, to keep them all in due subjection, and to make contemplation and practice, fervour and patient labouring, go hand in hand. And she yields not therefore to the more splendid pretentions of Rome, but points to her martyred king and archbishop, and those who then bore patiently the insults and persecutions of their enemies, and to Herbert and Walton, and Hammond and Andrewes, and Ken and Wilson, and others who have lived in her spirit and adorned her by their lives. Her clergy, during the great plague, many of them yielded not in their exertions to the saints of Rome, but they fearlessly passed on from the dead to the dying, ministering the last consolations to the passing soul; nor is her zeal now dead, and the labours of her Missionaries, and the toils and sufferings of her Bishops in heathen lands, need hardly be referred to. Those who will read the accounts of privations and labours undergone by them, their long and desolate voyages at the peril of their lives, their fearful fatigues of mind and body, their want, not of comforts only, but often almost of necessaries, need scarcely fear that the English Church has lost her life, or that her zeal is dead for ever. The labours of the Bishop of New Zealand alone might seem ample proof of this. We do not indeed lay claim to miracles, but the Romish claim does not pass without dispute; so many false miracles have been alleged and maintained in her communion, that we

may well doubt of all others which she vaunts. But even let them be admitted, they do not prove any more than a high degree of sanctity in the performers; they in no way prove that Rome possesses exclusive holiness; as neither would our want of them be any proof that our Church is not in her measure holy, and full of the spirit of God. Moreover it must be remembered that the Eastern Church claims them equally with the Roman.

Denying then the Romish exclusive claim, we admit her to be full of splendid appearances. And she is a dangerous enemy, from her very dazzling and from her adaptation to all tempers and kinds of mind; carrying on enthusiasm and nursing it in its own way, charming the imagination, soothing or alarming the superstitious, drawing out for each man his own particular temper, instead of tempering and chastening it, and bringing it into its due place and subordination to the whole system of moral duty and perfection. We may well dread her attack, but we need not therefore bow to her assumed authority. Mr. Northcote however seems to admit that we have some sanctity in our communion, although not of that splendid character, which he so admires; and it is worth observing, that he confesses the existence of one family, who, notwithstanding our asserted want of the presence of God, have nevertheless led lives of holiness, according to that contemplative pattern, which the Church of Rome praises so highly. With regard to the question of general sanctity; if we view the matter historically, we shall find all the most cruel persecutions, and the most revolting atrocities connected with, and patronized by, the Church of Rome; trace her through the past, even to the present day, and her history is one of persecution and blood, whilst those countries in which

her faith is held, have stood forth marked with fierce and sanguinary characters; nay the very oath of a Romish Bishop bears the same stamp in its promise to "persecute all heretics, &c." It is this stain of blood, which has made the hatred against Popery so burning; men cannot forget the days of Queen Mary, nor the treasonable and deadly plot in the days of King James the first; nor the massacre of St. Bartholomew, with its Papal approbation; nor other similar points in the history of the Church of Rome, and of those lands where the Roman faith prevails. The most fearful crimes, which have become matter of history, have occurred in Romish countries, nay, have for the most part been connected with the Church of Rome herself. The noblest of the early fathers disclaim violence as a means of enforcing orthodoxy; and the reprobation by St. Ambrose and St. Martin, and the excommunication of Idacius for a persecuting spirit, sufficiently tell the feeling of the early Church. Contrast with this the successive Papal decrees against heretics, starting from the Lateran council of 1215; passing by Pope Innocent's crusade against the Albigenses, and the cruel provisions of Honorius III. in 1224, we come to the establishment of the Inquisitions under Gregory IX., and from that time we read a succession of horrors, which could scarcely have been avoided, when we consider the stern cruelty of the decrees which governed those bodies. We read of the burning of two hundred, and three hundred heretics in a year in single towns, yet all these sink into insignificance, compared with the inquisitorial proceedings of Spain. In the year 1481, some two thousand heretics were burnt in Andalusia; and the total amount of those who suffered, during the

existence of this court in Spain, is about thirty-two thousand burnt, and two hundred and ninety-one thousand condemned to various imprisonments, and other punishments.

If we look to the present condition of Papal countries, we find no more cheering prospect. In Portugal, education, morality, cleanliness, are all at the lowest ebb. In Spain the late civil wars give sufficient testimony to the spirit animating the people; whilst the most popular of its amusements, patronised throughout the land, and equally loved by the noble and the serf, speaks somewhat plainly of an unfeeling brutalized spirit. In France indeed, minor offences are less common than in England, but offences of the graver sort, and against the person, bear a large proportion over this land; and in Italy, in all classes, a general looseness of morality and a fierceness of passions prevail, unknown in this country. In fact, in all the greater vices and most fearful crimes, Romish lands seem to bear much more of the poisoned fruit; so that murders in some places, take place in the open streets, yet often pass unheeded; and the discovery of a dead body causes but little surprise; observations made by those who have been eye witnesses of such things, and whose testimony can well be trusted. It is worth considering that in those countries where the greatest strictness, as regards religious observances, prevails, and which are exclusively Romish, there do we find these strong and violent passions in fullest force. Does then the confessional, according to the Roman system, produce so much better fruits than the system of the English Church? They seem to bear witness how it may become a mere form, and tend only to harden the heart, when indiscriminately enforced as in the Church

of Rome; in further proof of which, I would refer to some facts given by Mr. Palmer, in his Treatise.* And need we look further than Ireland for the working of the Papal system, where too often the lessons of the Priesthood are rebellion and murder? As alas they have been ever since the days when Archbishop Ussher uttered that remarkable prediction, so faithfully, so exactly, and so fearfully fulfilled in the massacres of 1641.—The Papal interference, and the weak yielding of the Government of Ireland in those days, has ever since borne that fruit, so distinctive of the Papacy, bloodshed, and rebellion. The Universities of Salamanca and Valladolid, in reply to the enquiry whether an Irish Papist may obey or assist his Protestant King, decided that he might not, and asserted two points; first, that since the Earl of Tyrone's war was a religious one, and under the Pope's sanction, it was equally right to fight against heretics with him, as to fight against the Turks; and second, that mortal sin lay at the door of all who assisted the English against him; and that without leaving the heretics and repenting, neither absolution nor salvation could be gained. Such was the substance of the answer; an answer strictly in accordance with the fourth Lateran council (canon iii. de Hæret.); an answer moreover on which the Romanists of Ireland have acted ever since, and will act, for it is an essential part of the spirit of the Roman Church. Neither are oaths any safeguard; even these may be dispensed with as soon as made: and the very oath of the Jesuits binds them to maintain all these opinions to the utmost, yet permits them to take other oaths with such "mental reservations," and in such a manner as virtually to make

* Part 1, ch. xi., 3.

them no oath at all.* Whatever may have been the misgovernment of Ireland, the crime and the rebellious and unruly spirit which pervade that land, are mainly and originally chargeable upon the Church of Rome.

For the argument drawn from devotional books, I can say but little about it, knowing but little myself about the devotional works of the Romish Church; but that they have an "unquestioned superiority," I deny. Many High-Churchmen, some even whose voice has weight in the English Church, do it is well known, refuse to acknowledge any such superiority,† and the Bishop of London has lately spoken plainly his opinion. They may suit some few minds in the Anglican Church, but the English tone is naturally of a graver character, and little likely to be pleased with works suited to the more fervid temperament of a warmer clime. As to their having been adapted to English use, it seems to prove little, because men of an universally warm or enthusiastic disposition, or of Romanising tendencies, not finding that which suited their wants in their own writers, would naturally turn their eyes to the works of other branches of the Church Catholic; but Romanists would hardly adapt our books, however excellent; for it is scarcely to be supposed that they would be desirous of using books, written by those whom themselves deem to be heretics.

On the question of sanctity I will add no more. If we regard history or the present characters of various nations, the comparison of the Church of Rome with that of England will, I am persuaded, be greatly to the

* The words of Euripides, so justly execrated, seem to be the motto and principle of Ignatius Loyola and his followers—ἡ γλῶττ' ὀμώμοχ' ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος.

† See Dr. Hook's preface to Dean Comber's admirable tract, "Friendly and Seasonable Advice to the Roman Catholics of England."

disadvantage of the former; if we take individuals, I am equally sure that we may be fully satisfied with our own communion; or if we survey the condition of the Churches, that of England appears putting forth a new and vigorous life, after having passed, undestroyed, through the most severe and trying dangers. That Rome has possessed men of splendid virtue and the highest nobility of soul, cannot be denied, and members of the Anglican Church would be of the last to deny this; but to admit the exclusive sanctity of Rome is quite another thing, and one which would be at once quite as firmly and strenuously denied; whilst there are points, which appear in her system, from which we should shrink with loathing; although some seem to meet them with too much approval.

I have now gone through the two points, on the definitions of which we are at variance, and which therefore cannot be made tests, until some more certain agreement is arrived at as to their nature. The remaining two notes of the Church are not matters of such dispute, as both the Churches are agreed in their notions of Catholicity and Apostolicity.

The first argument used against our Catholicity is founded on the name of Catholic. Now here we may admit several things; such as, that it was a very ancient term, appearing so early (and then for the first time) as in the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, on the martyrdom of St. Polycarp.* It seems here also used as synonymous with orthodox; a sense in which is was afterwards frequently used; and in which, it seems to be made a mark of the branches of the true Church by subsequent doctors; insomuch that the very name of

* Euseb. iv. 15.

Catholic should be a distinguishing sign between the hreetics, and true members of the Church. Knowing this, the Church of Rome urges it strongly upon us as a proof; but it is nevertheless one which cannot affect a member of the Anglican Church, unless he be prepared to yield up the sufficiency of Scripture, and to receive with equal reverence mere tradition. Before he can do this, he must cease to be a member of the English Church, because she founds no article of faith upon tradition, she only appeals to it to assist her in the right interpretation of Scripture according to the witness of primitive times. The very word "Catholic" does not so much as appear in Scripture—it is never once used; we therefore at once say, that the mere consideration, that the name of Catholics is generally applied to the Church of Rome, and not to us, can prove nothing against us, because however strongly some of the Fathers may speak upon the point, there is nothing *revealed* about it in Holy Scripture, neither do they pretend to say that there is; they only urge it as their own opinion. No, nor does even a Council affirm so much, for though Catholic be made one of the notes of the Church in the Creeds, yet it is so, as being a quality; as describing an attribute of the whole Church, saying that she would be Catholic, just as she would be Holy or Apostolic; but by no means even insinuating or hinting that the use of the word, as a name, would be a safe mark whereby to distinguish between the orthodox and the heretics. This opinion merely rests on the private notions of certain Doctors of high authority in the Church. Even suppose it be granted that it was a prevalent opinion at that time, yet this would prove nothing, for prevalent opinions even in the Church may be erroneous, provided only

that such an opinion is not subversive of the faith, which, I suppose, no one will pretend the one in question to be. We may therefore regard it as an error of no great moment, extensively prevailing, having no foundation whatever in Scripture (which we admit as our only sure ground of belief), nor even in any formal decision of the Church; and therefore we are at full liberty to reject it. Nor, in so doing, do we fall under the same censure as the Novatians, for they rejected the word altogether as a mark of the Church, claiming themselves alone to be the whole Church, although confined to a small part of the world. The Catholicity of the Church therefore, if once admitted, overthrew their whole claim; hence they attacked the very word in *any* sense; whereas we admit it, as expressing fully that which may be gathered from Scripture, viz. the universal extension, &c. of the Church; and we claim it to ourselves, not as did the Donatists, but as forming a part of that same Catholic, or Universally extended Church. But we say that the mere being *called* Catholics or not, is unessential, and proves nothing, and is said nothing about in Scripture, nay is not even Apostolical, because the word Catholic was not even used as applied to the Church as an attribute in the Apostles' days. This is evident, because admitted by St. Pacian himself in his disputes with the Novatians. It did not even form a part of the original "Apostles' Creed," but came in later, although very ancient. The origin of the opinion seems very traceable; the name being highly esteemed from very early times, and being a very sensible and plain mark of the Church, more so indeed than any other, was naturally more frequently appealed to as a test. Moreover the heretics in those days stood in direct opposition to the Church, so

that the enquiry as to which answered best to the name exclusively claimed by each party, was one of much weight. Followers of the opinions of one particular man, which were new and strange, would, whether rightly or wrongly, be naturally called after his name. And even had they been in the right, the name would scarcely die away; whereas their opponents could have no such particular name to be called by, and consequently their claim to the name of Catholic could not so easily be shewn to be false. Thus the followers of Novatus would naturally be called Novatians; of Nestorius, Nestorians; those who protested against Romish error, would be called Protestants. Their adversaries on the contrary, having nothing particular, from which to draw their name, would of course be more readily called, and more readily known, by the well known term, which they arrogate to themselves, as Catholics. Hence the name of Catholic would naturally become distinctive of that body, which gave occasion to no other; whilst their opponents, for distinction's sake, would not be so called, despite their claim; but would be better known according to that which first drew notice upon them. We may therefore well see the cause of the importance attached to the name of Catholic, and the origin of the opinion. It was a true and ancient note of the Church, and very distinctive, and often a very perfect and final test, as in the case of the Donatists; seeing all this, we need not wonder at the strong expressions of some of the fathers; neither need we be alarmed; for though then a satisfactory test, that does not prove that it would always be so between the maintainers of rival opinions, nor indeed do even the fathers say it would. We say then this; that heretics cannot be Catholics,

and we acknowledge the term to have been a good test in ancient days, merely because those, who obtained it not, happened to be heretics; not that they were necessarily heretics, merely because they did not obtain the name of Catholics.

Even if we granted all that Romanists desire on this point, still two reasons remain against their being admitted as being the whole Church. First, they are called by other names of various kinds, which would imply their being a sect; secondly, because in the East, the members of the Greek Church both call themselves, and are called, "Catholics;" whilst the converts to the Romish Church are not so called, and even themselves repudiate the name. Thus, if Mr. Northcote prefers this argument, he must admit, that in the East the Romanists are schismatical, and the Greeks orthodox, which would of course at once overthrow the whole Papal theory and claim. Yet he would be admitting no more, than has been uniformly admitted by Popes Gregory IX., and Eugenius IV., and the Council of Basel; which in so many words recognise the "Greek Church," the "Eastern Church," and their "Patriarchs;" talking of a "re-union of the Churches of Christ," calling their own at the same time the "Roman," the "Latin," the "Western" Church. One would think then that Romanists would do well to give up such an argument as this, which tells more against them than in their favour. That the "Roman" faith, and the "Catholic" faith should have been once synonymous terms, we may well believe, because in those days of dissension, Rome clung to the truth, and was the bulwark of orthodoxy, and held the first place amongst the Churches of Christ; so that all would naturally turn their eyes to

her, and when wishing to explain their meaning, point to her creed as the best explanation, and as being one which all would know and regard. Whatever may be said by any individuals within her pale, the Church of England claims the title of Catholic, a claim which no one of her members can yield up in her name, and which, we believe, the Church of Rome cannot justly deny; even though her influence extend not beyond her own temporal dominions, and though she be excluded from communion by the other Churches of Christ, she claims to be only a part, and therefore cares little how small may be the extent of her rule, compared with that of any other Church; and until her theory of unity be thrown down, her claim of Catholicity will stand.

We believe the very isolation of our Church at present, sad as it is, to be her safeguard, preventing, as it does, all chance of the Papal rule becoming gradually thrown over us anew; Rome must change, before we can hope to be one with her; and meantime we regard those who adhere to her communion as schismatics, yet with the excuse of prejudice; and the priests who minister at her altars in this land as schismatics, yet partly with the same excuse, partly under the plea of necessity, because so long as any continue in schism, with a hope of pardon from their circumstances, it is perhaps better that some should be found to give them guidance and hope, than that they should hopelessly perish for lack of it. This might in some degree be made a plea, and we trust that Romanists may be pardoned on the ground on which they hope for our forgiveness, viz., that of "invincible ignorance;" yet nevertheless they are in schism here, and our hope cannot be confident. Neither do we attach a spell to British soil, as regards those who rear

altars against our altars, but wherever an Episcopal Church exists not in communion with Rome, whether in America, or Sweden,* or the East, we deem the members of the Romish Church in those places, equally guilty of schism, as in this land. And though there be a Romish Patriarch at Constantinople or Antioch, we think no otherwise of him, than we should do, if he pretended to be a metropolitan in our own country.

The next point of attack is on the theory of a national religion, in which, as before, there seem to be numerous misrepresentations of that theory. As for pretending that the Church's "most powerful claim to obedience is, that it is the religion by law established," no Churchman would for a moment think of assenting to such an assertion. The Church of England claims obedience on the ground that she is the true Apostolical Church in this land, speaking those pure doctrines which rest on the authority of the undivided Church. She does not say that a national Church may oppose herself to the deliberate judgment of the whole Church Catholic, and thereby bring a schism into the Body of Christ; but she does maintain her right as a particular Church to reform abuses, and to cast off what she deems to be errors, even though they extensively, or almost entirely, prevail, unless they rest on the firm deliberate decision of the whole Church Catholic. She may no more change Christianity than she may abjure it: she is bound to hold all, which was delivered at the beginning, according to the settled and deliberate explanation of the whole Church; for

* I do not hereby mean to affirm the validity of Swedish Orders, they *seem* to be somewhat problematical; but I only therefore *suppose* them to be valid for the argument's sake,—certainly the spirit of the Swedish Church is not over Apostolical, to judge from the "Review" of the Archbishop of Upsal.

this reason, that the whole Church can never deliberately decree as an article of faith, any thing which would subvert that truth, of which she is "the pillar and ground." An error may prevail extensively, nay throughout her, provided it be not heretical; but we do not believe a fatal error could be decreed and universally held as a matter of faith, after due deliberation and search. The Church of England then maintains, that for belief, she holds all which the ancient Catholic Church authoritatively defined and decreed; and for discipline, she claims the right to regulate her own, provided that thereby, she in no way injures the faith. The former cannot change, for it is divine truth; the latter is changeable, being merely for order's sake, and according to circumstances. And before it can be proved that the Church of England has rejected any authoritative binding decree of the Church Catholic, the advocates of Rome must prove the divine institution of the Papal supremacy. Otherwise they cannot do away with the claim of the Eastern Church; and then they would be obliged to admit that the Church is divided, and has made no decree, at all binding, since that division; which is just what we maintain.

We say then that Scripture stands first, without the warrant of which we receive nothing. The Church is its witness and keeper, so that nothing can be lost therefrom, nor added thereto, such as to destroy the faith: she can explain that, which is the subject of doubt; decide on that which is matter of controversy; and that which thus comes to us with the stamp of her authority, we are bound to receive. Milner, in his "Letters to a Prebendary," himself admits that we acknowledge "a proper authority in the Church." Where the Catholic

Church has not decided, we maintain particular churches (that is churches under one certain jurisdiction), may speak, and all within those particular churches must obey. Where particular churches have not even spoken, each diocese is at free liberty, so that nothing be done against the order of the rest. But these particular churches we further maintain may vary in their extent, ordering, &c.; in a word, that they may be national: of this however more will be said when considering the question of Apostolicity, and the Regal Supremacy. All that is now necessary to speak about is, the independence of particular churches under their metropolitan, according to the extent above mentioned, and the Anglican theory. A few words may first be said as to the Reformation: the Western Church gradually submitted to the Papal rule, not however without numerous protestations: the reforming movement drew attention to the points attacked, and divines were compelled to consider them and the authority on which they stood. At length Henry VIII. forced on the English Church a consideration of the Papal Supremacy; the result of which was a conviction that it rested neither on divine institution nor on the authority of the Church. A primacy indeed was found, but no supremacy. The Papal Jurisdiction therefore being an usurpation, the English Church was clearly justified in throwing it off, if circumstances required it, and in resuming her own rights, as an independent Church under her metropolitan. This she did, when the Pope would not listen to what was required: the consequence was an enquiry into many doctrines, which were found to rest on no authority of the whole Church; and therefore deeming them corruptions, she was at liberty to cast them off and

purify herself; acting in all this in strict accordance with the canons of the Ancient Church. She allowed herself no private judgment where the Catholic Church had spoken, and so now she allows her children no private judgment where she has spoken; because in points of faith she speaks with the voice of the Church Universal on the unchangeable points of Truth, and in points of discipline, she has decreed what to herself seems most fitting, and she therefore contends that no individuals have a right to disturb her settled order; she alone has power to change, what she has thus ordered. And those very principles, on which she relies as her defence against Rome are her surest defence against Dissent. One allowance only can be made: matters of discipline being according to circumstances, variable, and for the sake of order only, are not essential; as then our Church cannot herself now speak with authority on these points, a certain degree of discretionary power seems left with her bishops and priests to dispense with immaterial things, if the enforcing them should produce more evil and disorder, than good and tranquility; yet this discretionary power can only be in cases of strong necessity; and every priest is bound to do his utmost to the carrying out his Church's rules and discipline, wheresoever it can be done without real injury to the Church's cause. This is the only private judgment she can allow, and in matters of faith there can be none whatever; what she rejects, her children must reject, what she teaches they must believe. Before quitting this matter, I must notice one of those extraordinary assertions which takes us by surprise in Mr. Northcote's Pamphlet. In page 81, we find it quietly assumed, that the Church of Rome and her obedience

constituted the Church Universal; otherwise what is the meaning of the words "The Church of England began with separating herself from the Church Universal;" whereas, it was only a sub-division of the Western Church, a separation within a separation; moreover, we were not alone in this separation; neither did we separate from Rome, but Rome from us. Again, we did so it seems, and "rejected both doctrines and sacraments which were received throughout Christendom." Suppose we did; yet there is no reason for believing that these were not widely prevalent errors, grown into positive teaching by length of time; they rested on no plain words of Scripture, on no authoritative creeds, were not held universally from the beginning, which we hold to be tests of truth. But this is only one of many strong assumptions, readily admitted by a Romanist, but denied at once by an Anglican, and therefore really affording no ground on which to build an argument. In fact we are perpetually met with arguments based on the idea that the Western Church is the whole Church; and we are reasoned with, as though the countless souls of the Greek Church had no existence on the earth.

However let us consider the independence of particular Churches. The 34th and 35th Apostolical Canons give the power to individual Bishops to arrange their own dioceses, but require in all matters of consequence, that the metropolitan and the Bishops under him should always take counsel together; and further, they guard against one Bishop interfering with the private powers of another in his own diocese. The 12th canon of Laodicea enjoins the appointment of Bishops by the judgment of the metropolitan and neighbouring Bishops. The

Canons of Antioch speak very plainly of the powers and rights of metropolitans in their provinces, and of synods of the Bishops of provinces under their metropolitans. Still stronger is the language of the 4th and 6th canons of the Council of Nicæa, in confirmation of the privileges of metropolitans, and of their mutual independence. The words of the 6th canon of the first Council of Constantinople set forth the rule as plainly as words can be made to do; and lastly, similar in their tone are the 19th, 25th, and 28th canons of the Council of Chalcedon.* Now, these canons speak more or less plainly, some defining the privileges of Bishops, other of metropolitans; and even proceeding to notice the rights and powers of Patriarchs; but they all concur in the one principle, of ending disputes where they began, free from the interference of other Churches; unless assistance should be absolutely necessary, or especially requested. And to these canons, others might be added, from other Councils, all tending the same way. Neither was the practice of the Ancient Church different. It was on this principle that St. Polycarp retained his own custom, though different from that of St. Anicetus; on the same ground, the Asian Churches held to their own custom, against St. Victor; for the same principle St. Cyprian contended, when Felicissimus appealed from the judgment of his own Church to Cornelius. And again, when he and the Asiatic Churches so strenuously maintained their own opinions on the question of heretical baptism; similar was the decided judgment of the African Church against Pope Cœlestine in the case of Apiarius, when the interference of other Churches with any Church under its

* Canon viii. Council of Ephesus, may be worth comparing with the rest.

metropolitan was emphatically protested against; nay, this very African Church made a canon against the admission of any foreign jurisdiction; and throughout its early history, seems almost as though it were intended for a special witness to prove, in after days, the principles maintained and acted on by the English Church; we need no stronger testimony; indeed the pages of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine are such, that we might rest our cause upon them. The following words of the latter Saint seem to clearly set forth the custom of the Church; viz., the independence of particular Churches, and their right to judge of, and terminate their own disputes, (provided of course, the Catholic Church had not previously decided;) and the right of interference from other Churches, only when the particular Church desired it through inability to compose herself.—"The African Bishops had a contest between themselves; if they could not arrange between themselves the dissension which had arisen, so that the wrong side should either be reduced to concord, or deprived, and they who had the good cause, to remain in the communion of the whole world through the bond of unity; there was certainly this resource left, that the Bishops beyond the sea, where the largest part of the Catholic Church is spread, should judge concerning the dissensions of their African colleagues."* Nor was it only in cases of discipline that particular Churches claimed and had this right; some of these cases refer to doctrine and points of faith. The Council of Gangra, not pretending to settle matters except for its own part of the Church, even makes twenty canons, with anathemas to support them. The Church of England then considered such

* Quoted by Allies. "Church of England Cleared, &c." Page 67.

points, as were forced upon her attention, and rested not on any good authority; and in so doing, did no more than belonged of right to every particular Church.

Perhaps, however, it would be as well to speak upon the point of particular Churches and national Churches being sometimes convertible terms. The very constitution of the Ancient Church implies as much; for the Patriarchates, Dioceses, &c., of those days have been clearly shewn by Crakanthorpe, to have followed the temporal divisions of the Roman Empire. Indeed, the very terms used shew the same; for we hear of the Church of Spain, the Church of Gaul, the Church of Africa, and so on.* The very raising of Constantinople to her high place amongst the Patriarchates was expressly stated to be on account of the temporal position to which she had attained, as Empress of the Eastern world.† Princes have, moreover, suppressed sees and founded new ones, and changed the metropolitical chair, and have "made the Institutions of the Church follow those of the world;"‡ that is in matters of discipline and constitution, which in no way interfere with the faith, or any points essential to the being of the Church. Nor does any difference thereby occasioned really injure the Church, or St. Polycarp would never have thought himself justified in continuing a difference on so great a point, as the time of observing Easter. Let all those Churches, which we regard as true branches of the one vine, be as one, and let them deliberate, as at Nicæa; let the whole Church thus give her calm and well considered judgment, and it

* Compare Canon ii., first Council of Constantinople. Canon xxx., Council of Chalcedon.

† First Council of Const., Canon iii. Council of Chalcedon, Can. xxviii.

‡ See below, on the Test of Apostolicity.

will be time for us to consider our position. But until such time, we hold our right as a National or particular Church, to decide ourselves for ourselves these disputed and undecided points. Uniformity is truly to be desired and aimed at; but uniformity must not be purchased at the expense of truth. And let it always be remembered that we find ourselves in the English Church; and that her claim therefore upon our allegiance stands first—our part is not to enquire into the claims of Rome, but of the English Church. If they are well founded we have nothing to do with any others; we may not tamper with Roman temptations, unless it be proved to us first of all, that our own Church is in schism.

On one other ground our Catholicity is attacked, in the matter of doctrine. Which attack is divided into two parts, a consideration of the fairness of such a test, and a review of some doctrines. The test is objected to as not being a simple and obvious one, such as we might expect from Catholicity being made a note of the Church in the creed, and from the language of the early Fathers concerning it. But in the first place, one scarcely sees how the term Catholic is thereby rendered more difficult of proof, than any other of the notes of the Church. It would require equal learning to prove unity through the Sacraments, &c., such as we maintain, or to prove Apostolicity. But there are many things equally important, which generally must be received upon trust; and which to prove them, would require equal learning and diligence with this one question; and one does not see how a Church is to prove herself Apostolical, and explain the meaning of Apostolicity, without requiring quite as deep research and knowledge of antiquity. Every sect probably would claim this

note to itself, and before we could shew it to mean a succession of ministers, descending from the Apostles in a threefold order; and still more before we could shew such an unbroken succession to belong to any Church, the utmost labour and toil would be necessary. Few only would be able to enquire into such a subject, and to prove the point; the rest must take it as proved on their word; and so it is with Catholicity of doctrine; one is not the least more obvious than another. Moreover, St. Cyril's own second definition* of "Catholic" would surely require an equal amount of deep reading, with the one objected to, should the teaching of the Romish Church be called in question and need defence. But the English Church does no more make Catholicity to consist only in doctrine, than does the Roman. We accept all St. Cyril's definitions, and claim to be Catholic, or a part of the Catholic Church, in respect of all.

We do not say that the Church has no right to add to the explanations already in the creeds, we only deny her power to impose as a point of faith, that which in former times was not so considered. That belief which saved St. Polycarp, we believe will save us, neither may the Church require any more. She preserves, and explains, and decides, but cannot add one tittle to the primitive faith. If invocation of Saints was unnecessary of old, the Church cannot make it necessary to salvation. She may not add to the faith, but she may explain it; she may not coin new articles, but she may set forth the old ones more clearly; and this is all which she did, either in the days of Arius or Macedonius. And we receive those creeds, either because resting

* Catechisis xviii.

on the authority of the Church through universal acceptance, or because (if that cannot be proved) we hold them to be most agreeable to scripture and true primitive teaching. Because they are decided upon by a general Council is not our ground for acceptance, for general Councils have no virtue in themselves by which they are infallible, and in fact, it is not agreed what makes a Council to be really general, according to the Romish acceptation of the term. We believe them to be very useful for deliberation and comparison, and naturally to have very great weight in the decision of a controverted point, but no more than this. We do not hold them to be infallible.

The force of Mr. Northcote's third objection to the test, I confess myself utterly unable to discover. Is it meant that the Church can never have her communion interrupted? but this Ecclesiastical History denies. Or does it mean that there cannot be two distinct Churches both Catholic? certainly we do not say that there can. Or is it meant that there cannot be two parts of the Church; one of which holds some part of the faith, the other the rest, and neither all which is essential? Here also we agree. But we do say, that there may be two or more parts of the Church, not in open communion, but all holding the essentials of the faith, yet variously adding to them unauthorized and corrupt opinions; that is holding all truly essential Catholic doctrine with something in addition. We also are most ready to admit that Catholicity is something permanent; but in maintaining this, the Church of Rome annihilates her own claim, for "it must be remembered that from the eleventh to the sixteenth century, the Roman communion was limited to Europe. It numbered no per-

manent adherents in Africa or Asia. The Latin Churches of the East, transplanted by the Crusaders, existed but for a short time, and to a very limited extent;" so that either the Church once ceased to be Catholic, or the Roman communion is not the whole Church. On the question of one seat of vitality in the body of the Church, I have before touched. We believe Christ to be that only seat, and we must protest most strongly against deciding such a question by our own reason and ideas of right; as though we could see all God's dispensations and modes of working. Antecedent probability in such a case is pure rationalism, and may as well develope into Infidelity, as into Romanism. Nor can the claim put in by Rome be any corroboration whatever, resting as it does on no Scriptural authority, and opposed as it is to many places of ancient teaching, and ancient practice. Its origin, and rise, and final extensive acknowledgment, together with the causes of all this, are too clearly traceable in the history of the Church, to need any other explanation, or to permit of its being any confirmation of an "antecedent probability." For "development" in the sense, in which Romish writers use it, we reject the very idea; nothwithstanding Mr. Newman's attempt to overthrow the testimony of St. Vincentius Lirinensis, we still hold to his rule, and receive only that "which has been received always, everywhere, and by all." We have it admitted that the rule of Vincentius, "is the rule of historical interpretation which has been professed in the English School of Divines."* Tertullian's whole argument against heretics was founded on this same doctrine, and accordingly we are told that "Tertullian asserted with *exaggeration* the immutability of the

* "Essay on Development." Page 8.

creed."* The maintainers of the theory of development are compelled to reject, and if possible, overthrow the authority of the writers of the Ancient Church; for it is not one, but all from St. Irenæus, (nay, from St. Ignatius)† who teach the same doctrine, viz., that the Church may receive only that which is handed down from the beginning, without loss and without addition. In fact, development was a heresy of the very worst kind in the opinion of the Fathers. We therefore reject the theory with justice, feeling ourselves safe with the Primitive Church; nay, Rome professedly rejects it also, and some of her ablest divines, such as Bellarmine, Bossuet, &c., must be condemned ere this theory can be made true. We believe St. Paul, that he had kept back nothing, but had "declared the whole counsel of God," and therefore we follow the advice of another Apostle, and "contend for the faith once (for all) delivered to the Saints." However, the question of developments in Christianity, is one far beyond my power, and is indeed treated of abundantly by others. I will only say, that I have found as yet no reason for receiving, but many for rejecting it, as opposed to primitive teaching, and subversive of the faith.

Neither can I feel myself fitted to enter on the question of the Papal supremacy to which Mr. Northcote adverts. I have before mentioned what I believe to be insuperable difficulties in the way of its claims, and to these I would add the dispute of St. Hilary, of Arles, with St. Leo; a history of too important a nature to be passed by when regarding this question; shewing as it

* "Essay, &c." Page 349.

† Euseb. His. Eccl. iii., 36. See Palmer on Doctrine of Development. P. 1, C. viii., page 177, 214, who shews from abundant testimony of primitive Catholic writers, the same doctrine.

does, the claims which Rome was beginning to put forth strongly, and the unyielding resistance offered by a Saint of the Church. To advert to a few of those places mentioned by Mr. Northcote; no one denies the primacy of Rome, especially in the early days of her temporal dominion, and what more can possibly be derived from the expression of St. Ignatius, ("the Church which holds the first place," προκαθηται) it is difficult to conceive. Again, had the quotation from St. Irenæus been given at full length, it would have appeared that the resorting to the Church of Rome, and the consequent preservation of the faith therein, is not from any divine virtue in that Church, but from the position of the city as Empress of the world. For St. Cyprian,—his own acts, may form a comment on his own words, for the Pope never had a more unyielding opponent; neither does St. Augustine hold him blameable for this, but on the contrary, holds him justified, because it was a question not decided by the Church. The words of St. Gregory Nazianzen are no more than an assertion that Rome had kept the faith up to that time, a mere historical fact which is not denied perhaps, but the conclusion of his words seems rather to refer this to her temporal position. St. Jerome's words are strong; but his position, the troubled and divided state of the Eastern Church, where he was then residing, nay, his own words, when the passage is read at full length, give the key to his meaning, and explain away the difficulty. I have before mentioned his words as to the equal power of Bishops; and I would ask, what equal power can there be, if the Bishop of Rome has an inherent jurisdiction over all others, an inherent indefectibility, an inherent right of being the centre of

unity to all Christendom, so that all whom he excommunicates are cut of from the Church? And moreover, this very St. Jerome, arguing against a custom of the Romish Church, and seeking authority, exclaims, "the world is greater than the city:" shewing, the World and Rome might be at variance, and that in this case, if yielding on either side were necessary, Rome should yield to the authority of the World, and not the World to Rome. The text quoted from St. Optatus is the only one alleged, which can be called a difficulty; and the whole passage from which it is taken, is somewhat obscure,—it has been ably considered by Mr. Palmer, in his "Episcopacy Vindicated," who shews the argument to be a popular one; and moreover, that the "chair of Peter," means no more than the "chair of Cyprian," the chair of the lawful successors of the Apostles, of the regularly descended Episcopate which was founded in Peter. For taking Peter as the type of the Episcopate, because in his person the Apostolical powers were bestowed upon all, it was the custom of the ancient writers to mention "the chair of Peter," meaning thereby, nothing more than the chair of the one lawful Bishop of the Church mentioned, i. e. the Episcopal chair. These passages adduced, are a fair sample of the proofs which Rome brings in support of her claims; this one from Optatus being, perhaps, the only one of any difficulty. The others wear indeed a startling aspect at first sight, standing out by themselves, and we might well think, that if they were true, primitive testimony is against us. But let none change their faith on the strength of isolated passages, however cumulative the evidence may seem; let them at least search, and see whether these things really are as they appear.

Mr. Newman produces a formidable array of cumulative evidence* in support of the Papal claim, just as Mr. Northcote endevours to do; but then it looks so formidable, simply because all the prior and subsequent events, and the circumstances of the case are not added; but add these and all is changed. Just for instance, as we are pressed by the argument that St. Athanasius appealed to Pope Julius, and that that Pope ordered him to be restored to his see. But take into account all the circumstances of the case, the high position of Rome, and her orthodoxy in those days of strife, there seems little to be surprised at that an expelled prelate should fly to her and seek her communion, and strive to gain her approval of his opinions. Neither is there anything very strange in the Bishop of the Church appealed to, considering the case, and, on finding the appellant firm in the truth, requiring his restoration, or threatening to refuse communion to his adversaries; any Bishop might have this power; but add to it that, notwithstanding Pope Julius' lofty pretensions, the Eastern Bishops returned a counter threat of excommunication; also consider the full force and meaning of the canon of the Council of Sardica, so plainly opposed to any notion of an *ancient* right of appeal, and surely the whole matter proves little in favour of the Roman supremacy; thus will it be found in almost all cases; that which appears at first sight cumulative evidence in favour of Rome, will, on examination, turn out to be cumulative evidence rather against her. Let it be remembered moreover, that circumstances might induce Bishops to appeal to Rome, without therefore holding that she had right to require such appeals, so that even facts counte-

* "Essay on Development." Page 22.

nancing her claim, might really be of little value as proofs. Whereas, facts against her claim, such as those on which we rely, to wit, St. Cyprian's opposition, the African refusal of obedience, and such like, are proofs of a strong kind, because they shew clearly, and past doubt, that her claim was not admitted, and because their value cannot be diminished; so that three or four cases of disobedience would be ample proof *against* a claim, which twenty of such obedience might be insufficient to establish; and yet Rome brings forward scarcely any which, when fully examined, do not speak as much against her as in her favour. On the other hand, we find men dying out of her communion, yet considered Saints; we find individuals and Churches suffering her withdrawal of communion without yielding; we find appeals against her decision, and that decision reserved by a Saint of the Church; we find individuals and Churches resisting her claim of jurisdiction; we find her threats of excommunication returned; nay, further that African Church, which resisted her in the person of St. Cyprian; which opposed Pope St. Cœlestine; which interdicted appeals to Bishops across the seas; in the sixth century assembled a synod, and even excluded from the Catholic Church and *excommunicated* Vigilius who was then Pope, granting him only opportunity for repentance.* Do these things speak much for any ancient belief of the necessity of union with Rome, and for her claim of jurisdiction? Nor is it necessary to regard with Mr. Northcote, the blessing of St. Peter as a prophecy for Rome; for very natural causes will fully account for the development of the supremacy. And there is no reason for believing St. Peter to have possessed

* Victoris Tununensis Chronicon. Page 10. Edit. Scalig.

anything more than a mere primacy; his was not a supremacy; much less did it descend to the Church of Rome. With reference to Mr. Northcote's assertion of the similarity of teaching in the Roman and Greek Churches; I would in the first place desire to remark, that four great points maintained by Rome, are rejected by the East, as well as by the Church of England; viz., the Papal Supremacy; Communion in one kind; the Celibacy of the Clergy; and the doctrine of Purgatory. In these great questions and the important doctrine of justification by faith, the Eastern agrees with the English Church against the Roman; and what is more, she with us admits no development, maintaining that all things were perfect from the beginning, and holding to the same rule of Vincentius, to which the Church of England adheres. On other matters, again, though she does not decree Roman doctrine, yet she seems not to reject it; the doctrine of seven Sacraments seems to be generally, but not universally, maintained within her pale, yet not as essential matters of faith. Transubstantiation again is apparently held by some, but not received by others of her children.* On some other points it must be admitted, such as a relative honour to pictures,† and invocation of Saints, the Eastern Church agrees with the Roman. On other minor questions, she differs from both our own and the Roman, such as the practice of trine immersion and the chrisma after baptism; practising extreme unction, but also allowing the

* Compare the canons of the Synod of Bethlehem, 1672, with the words of Platon, Archbishop of Moscow; Theophanes, Archbishop of Novogorod; Methodius, Archbishop of Twer; and many others cited by Mr. Palmer in his Treatise, when considering the Oriental Churches.—The assertions here made concerning the Doctrines of the Eastern Church rest upon these authorities, and that of the Catechism of Peter Mogila, Archbishop of Kioff, 1643.

† Carved images are rejected according to the second commandment.

annointing all sick persons for their recovery, (which we hold to be the proper meaning of the text on which the practice is founded;) and again, she agrees with us in denying works of supererogation. Thus there are points, and these important ones, in which her agreement with our own Church is strong testimony in our favour against Rome: others, wherein her disagreement from all the West world prevent our proving the Catholicity of either doctrine from the custom observed: others, wherein Rome may to a certain extent, make her a witness against us; I say, to a certain extent, because the holding of these doctrines by both Churches would in no way prove their Catholicity, for they might be corruptions widely spread and received previous to the separation, and afterwards retained in both communions, such as picture worship; or they might have crept afterwards into both Churches, in consequence of the discussions carried on by the respective advocates of each communion.—Thus their *agreement* is but little proof against us; but their *disagreement* is strong proof for us, when desirous of disproving the Catholicity of Roman teaching; because though they might well have added corruptions, it is very improbable that they would have ever lost anything which they had once held; except by such an event as was our reformation, and this never happened to the Eastern Church. We therefore claim the Greek Church as a strong testimony to the primitiveness and Catholicity of our teaching against the decrees of Trent. Nor because both East and West were overspread by error need we regard Catholicity as lost; for errors, not subversive of the faith, may prevail through the Church, infallibility and Catholicity still continuing to live, because though the truth

were added to and defaced, yet all the truth nevertheless remained, and all things essential to salvation were preserved; as they ever will be to the end of the world.

Mr. Northcote thinks that the English Church must make out a strong case of purer teaching, than the teaching of Rome, to justify her present separation from that communion. But herein he passes over two facts; one that we did not separate, nor wish to separate from Rome, but Rome from us, and that therefore it lies with Rome, not with us, to shew cause for this separation; the other, that the question of supremacy, and not difference of teaching, was the real ground of the separation; and therefore that this point, and this only, is needful to justify the Church of England. Henry VIII., the Church of England herself,* and some of the most prominent amongst her reformers, openly proclaimed their desire not to separate from Rome, but only to use their own just rights in peace. This is a point too plain to need any proof, and none, I suppose, would have the hardihood to deny it; and it is as clear, as it is true, that the objection raised against her, was for abolition of Papal jurisdiction, appeals, annates, and such like.—It was not until the eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth, that the Pope forbade communion with our Church; a tolerably plain proof of two things; that he regarded our orders as valid, and that he believed us to possess all the essentials of a Christian Church. But to go further, two Popes, Paul IV. and Pius IV., offered to confirm our book of Common Prayer, thereby acknowledging the efficacy to salvation of all our rites and ordinances; the perfection of our ordinal and our sacramental services; the orthodoxy of our doctrine;

* Canons 1603. Canon xxx.

indeed proving for us all we require; all this was offered, provided one thing, and one only were done, and that was, that the Papal supremacy should be acknowledged. Shewing thereby, beyond dispute, that the question of the supremacy was the sole real cause of separation, and is the sole point on which the whole matter turns: nay, and not Popes only, but eminent Romish controversialists have variously confirmed our orthodoxy; our orders were defended by Courayer, and acknowledged by Bossuet; our articles have been almost entirely approved by Davenport and Du Pin; wherever we are attacked, saving on the matter of rejecting the Papal jurisdiction, our adversaries themselves defend us. Surely this should be of itself sufficient answer to Romanists when they attack the Catholicity of our doctrine. Yet let us go further, and though it might be that in some points the Saints of ancient days might find the Church of Rome more in accordance with their feelings than our own, (for we pretend not to perfection ourselves in the first place; and in the second, we do not say that even those days were perfectly pure; and in the third, we maintain that many things, then innocently practised, and in themselves good, have been found to be dangerous in their tendencies, and better omitted;) yet granting this, we believe most fully that as a whole, the Anglican Church is infinitely nearer to primitive practice and teaching than is the Roman; and that the Saints of olden days, were they to see the theory of both Churches fully carried out in practice, the rites of both observed, the doctrines of both maintained and acted upon, would join themselves to the Church, not of Rome, but of England; and this so much the more, the nearer we took them to the Apostolic age.

St. Chrysostom, arguing against the Apollinarian heresy, (which asserted that the human and divine nature of Christ were only one nature, not two distinct and perfect natures, the perfect Godhead and the perfect manhood united in one person,) writes thus* in defence of the Catholic doctrine. Christ is "God because impassible, man because of his passion. One Son, one Lord; the same beyond all doubt possessing one dominion, one power of two united natures; even although these natures are not consubstantial, but retain unmixed, each their own properties, because though two, they are not confused. For as the bread before consecration we call bread; but when sanctified by the divine grace, at the mediation of the Priest, it is called no longer bread, but is thought worthy of the name of the body of the Lord, although the nature of the bread remains in it; and we speak not of two bodies, but of one body of the Son; so here the divine nature being joined with the human body, the two together make up one Son, one person. Yet we must acknowledge an inconfused and indivisible mode (of union) not in one nature only, but in two perfect ones." Now, here we have first of all, a positive assertion that though the bread in the Eucharist is *called* "the Body of the Lord," yet that it remains bread in its own nature, and secondly this is used to illustrate and prove the indivisible union of the godhead and manhood in one person, yet without confusion of substance; and therefore St. Chrysostom (even had he spoken less plainly than he has done,) could have left no doubt that he regarded the Body of Christ and the bread to be united after consecration, yet without confusion, the substance of each

* Epistola ad Cæsarium.

remaining perfect. Again, this same Saint saith,* "It is a carnal thing to doubt how Christ descends from heaven, and how he can give us his flesh to eat; all these things, I say are carnal, which are mystical and to be *spiritually* understood," and he calls it carnal, to "take things simply as they are said, nor to think of any other meaning in them." St. Augustine† also: "It is not this body which you see, that you shall eat, neither is it this blood which my crucifiers shall shed that you shall drink; it is a Sacrament which I commend unto you, which being spiritually understood shall quicken you." And what he means by a Sacrament, he shews plainly, saying,‡ "We mind in the Sacraments not what they are, but what they shew; for they are signs, which are one thing and signify another." And again,‖ "Let no man look to what they are, but what they signify, for our Lord was pleased to say, this is my body, when he gave the sign of his body." My present design prevents my multiplying instances, but we may safely assert that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not only unknown to the Fathers, but by many of them by anticipation disclaimed and refuted; but those who would see this clearly proved, without the necessity of searching through the Fathers, may read with satisfaction, Bishop Cosin's Treatise on Transubstantiation; from whom also I will quote an explanation of the Anglican doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. "We believe a presence and union of Christ with our soul and body, which we know not how to call better than Sacramental, that is, effected by eating; that while we eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine,

* VI. Joan, Hom. 46. † De doctr. Christ. lib., iii., 16.
‡ Cont. Max., L. iii., c. 22. ‖ De doctr. Christ., c. 7.

we eat and drink therewithal the body and blood of Christ, not in a corporeal manner, but some other way, incomprehensible, known only to God, which we call spiritual, ... We confess with the Fathers that this manner of presence is unaccountable and past finding out, not to be searched and pried into by reason, but believed by faith. And if it seems impossible that the flesh of Christ should descend, and come to be our food through so great a distance, we must remember how much the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds our sense and our apprehensions, and how absurd it would be to undertake to measure his immensity by our weakness and narrow capacity; and so make our faith to conceive and believe what our reason cannot comprehend." Such is undoubtedly the teaching of the English Church. And I feel very certain that to that Church would St. Chrysostom join himself sooner than to one, which by her teaching, nullifies his whole argument; and likewise St. Augustine, rather than yield assent to a dogma which entirely overthrows his idea of a Sacrament. These two Saints* both accuse the Blessed Virgin of sin, and that not slight, nor only once; they accuse her of seeking her own honour; of a desire to shew her power improperly; and this even to the interruption of other good deeds which were being performed; and other things of a like kind. Yet the Council of Trent† declares that by "the special privilege of God" she avoided all, even venial sins. Would the Holy Fathers, who record her sins, have joined themselves to the Church of Rome, or to a

* S. Chrys. in Mat. hom., 44, 45.; in Johan., hom., 21. S. Aug., de symb., ad Catech., i., 14. P. 562. Vol. iv. See also Theophylact in Mat. 12. S. Irenæus adv. Hær., l., 3. (All these and others are referred to by Beveridge on the 15th article.)

† Sessio vi. de Justif.; Canon xxiii.

Church, which like our own, acknowledges her blessedness, but asserts that Christ alone was without sin? Again, St. Epiphanius declares her to be inferior to the angels, saying, that if it was unlawful to worship the angels, much more is it unlawful to worship her;* and bidding that she should be honoured; the Lord worshipped; adding, "let no one worship Mary."† Once more, St. Augustine‡ commands, that "the Saints be honoured for imitation, not adored out of religion." So also the epistle of the Church of Smyrna (preserved by Eusebius) repudiates the worship of (προσκυνησις, falling down before,) Saints and relics, or any one but only the Lord. Now what would all these holy men say if they entered into a Church, and beheld tapers burning, and people kneeling before waxen dolls, covered with jewels, and representing the Virgin, such as may be seen in Romish Churches abroad, particularly in Belgium? Would they not fly thence in disgust, and rather be members of a Church, which thanks God for the holiness of his Saints, and remembers their lives, and holds the Virgin in honour, and calls her blessed; yet gives worship and adoration to the Trinity alone? I might go on from one question to another; but "if we carried on our examination through all the details of doctrine in which the Church of England differs from the Church of Rome, I am persuaded the result would be the same; we should find" almost always, in the Roman system the subversion and contradiction:—in the Anglican, the counterpart of the primitive idea. But I forbear mentioning any more, for doctrines, each of which has been treated at great length by the most learned defenders of our Church, cannot be thus hastily passed over in a few

* Hæres. 79, s. 5. † 79, s. 7. ‡ De verâ relig., cap. 55.

words. Those who would see more, must look into the deep researches and learned works of Ussher, and Andrewes, and Taylor, and others who have stood nobly forward in their day. For myself, I could not feel fitted to argue such questions. Such fitness is to be attained only by the long labour, and painful research, of many years; and ere we can place confidence in arguments on these deep matters, he who advances them must wear the brow traced with lines of thought, or the silvered hair, whose change gives notice of the experience of age. Nor would I have referred to such questions at all, but simply to shew that there are words and phrases, not easily explained away, directly contrary to Romish teaching, and yet set forth plainly by the Fathers, at the same time in full agreement with the Anglican doctrine. It was needful to touch slightly on these subjects, because Mr. Northcote had already done so; but it must be remembered that the Church of England claiming to be Catholic in doctrine, claims to be Catholic also on all other grounds, by which Catholicity may be shewn.

There yet remain two or three points necessary to be noticed ere we quit this part of the pamphlet. We are told that the English Church "suffers her thousands, and tens of thousands, to go to their graves, laden with the guilt of mortal sin; unconfessing and unabsolved." With the question of confession and absolution,* I have already done, nor can it be doubted that the English Church holds the doctrine and admits the absolving power of the Priest, as fully as does the Roman. But what I would say is this, that on the other hand, the Church of Rome by her compulsory

* See Bishop Taylor's "Dissuasive from Popery." Sec. xi.

confession, forces "her thousands, and tens of thousands, to go to their graves, laden with the guilt of mortal sin," increased a hundredfold, by coming to what they believe to be a solemn Sacrament, without sorrow for the past, or any purpose of amendment for the future. Those who need and can be benefitted by confession in the English Church, may practice it as freely as in the Roman; but those whom it would injure are at least prevented from adding to their already heavy guilt by a deliberate mockery of God. Once more; the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice is not condemned by our article, but only the monstrous perversion of it, commonly believed in the Church of Rome. For our Church does hold a sacrifice, which were sufficiently proved by her using the words of institution without protest or explanation; because Bingham shews, that these words with the breaking of bread, &c., were always representative of the original sacrifice on the Cross; and therefore the Church of England thereby makes a representative sacrifice, offering to God representatively the death and passion of His Son; and pleading thereby most earnestly for the remission of sins. It is not a repeated and carnal, but a representative spiritual sacrifice; Christ is not offered up again, but yet that first offering is in a most lively manner set before God, and its memorial made to plead in our behalf, and accordingly with reference to this part of the Eucharistic service, we afterwards pray that "by the merits and death of Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all the whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion." "We are persuaded," says Archbishop Wake,* "that by our prayers, which in this holy

* "Exposition, &c." Article on the Mass.

solemnity we never fail to offer for the wants and necessities, the pardon and forgiveness not of ourselves only, but of all mankind; of those who have not yet known the faith of Christ, or, that knowing it, have prevaricated from the right way; we incline God's mercy to become propitious unto them." And similarly Archbishop Laud writes;* "In the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices, one by the Priest only, that is the commmemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, represented in bread broken and wine poured out." And this is the sacrifice which we understand to be the sacrifice of the Primitive Church, and one very far removed from the Roman teaching, condemned by our 31st article. Nor do we believe it used by the ancient Church for the dead, any further than as prayers were made for them, a question too lengthy to be entered upon here, but which is shewn clearly by Archbishop Ussher† to be different from the doctrine maintained by Rome. Nor do I hesitate to state my belief, that if St. Augustine were called upon to choose between a Church, which like our own omits prayer for the dead, (Catholic as the practice is if not indiscriminately used)‡ or a Church, which like that of Rome, joins with it a doctrine of purgatory and pardons, with all their concomitants, he would accept the former with its defect, rather than the latter with its fearful corruptions, and too often "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

Few things are more astonishing in the whole pamphlet under consideration, than the astounding assertion that the English Church speaks doubtfully of the real

* Against Fisher, 35. † Answer to a challenge made by a Jesuit.

‡ See Bishop Bull, "Corruptions of the Church of Rome."

presence.* Her articles assert the Sacraments to be "effectual signs," and further affirm that "the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." Turn we to her homilies; and there we are told, that "we must be sure to hold that in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent; but the communion of the body and blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation which, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, is through faith, wrought in the souls of the faithful." Her catechism tells us that the body and blood of Christ "are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." In the communion office we pray to "eat of the flesh" of Christ, and "to drink his blood." And again, to "be partakers of his most blessed body and blood;" after receiving, we thank God that we have been fed "with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood" of God's Son; but above all in the exhortation we are instructed, that we "spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us." Now what is there to set off against these plain and strong expressions? Merely one solitary protest, the words of which are so far from appearing to me to repudiate the real presence, that I think them a confirmation of the doctrine. When we regard the history of that protestation, and remember that for a few years in King Edward's time the words were "or unto *any real or essential presence* there being,

* I can scarcely do better than refer Mr. Northcote on this whole subject, to "The Theological Works of the Rev. John Johnson, M.A., Vicar of Cranbrook," the first of which is just re-published by Parker, on "The Unbloody Sacrifice."

of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood;" that in Queen Elizabeth's time this protestation was omitted altogether, and that when restored in 1662, the words "real and essential presence" were changed into "corporeal presence;" I cannot understand how this can be taken for anything else than as a decided intimation that there is a "real and essential presence," but not a "corporeal" one; that is, not a gross carnal sensible presence, but a spiritual one, mysterious and utterly incomprehensible, yet nevertheless real. Thus then we do hold a real spiritual presence, and a real spiritual sacrifice. "Chrysostom," saith Bishop Jewel, "sheweth in what sense other ancient Fathers used this word sacrifice;" for as he saith, "we offer up the same sacrifice that Christ offered," so in most plain wise, and by sundry words he removeth all doubt, and declareth in what sort and meaning we offer it. He saith not "we offer up the Son of God to his Father, and that verily and indeed;" but contrariwise thus he saith, "we offer indeed, but in remembrance of his death. This sacrifice is an example of that sacrifice. This that we do is done in remembrance of that that was done. We offer up the same that Christ offered; or rather, we work the remembrance of that sacrifice." Thus we offer up Christ; that is to say, an example, a comemmoration, a remembrance of the death of Christ. This kind of sacrifice was never denied. So Bishop Patrick, "we keep as it were in (God's) memory and plead before him the sacrifice of his Son, which we shew unto him, humbly requiring that grace and pardon and all other benefits of it, may be bestowed on us. And as the minister doth most powerfully pray in virtue of Christ's sacrifice when he represents it unto God, so" &c.

"Such an unbloody sacrifice, which is only rememorative, and in representation we all acknowledge." Again, "after the bread and wine are deputed by holy prayer to God to be used for a commemoration of Christ's death, though they do not cease to be what they were before, yet they begin to be something which they were not before this consecration. All the effects and benefits of his passion are imparted to us by these, which in themselves, are but God's creatures of bread and wine, yet by his appointment, become to us the body and blood of his Son." Bishop Wilson calls the bread and wine, "not common food," but "holy representatives of Christ's body and blood, made such by an especial blessing from God." Bishop Taylor says, "Christ's ministers offer up the same sacrifice to God, the sacrifice of the Cross, by prayers and a commemorating rite and representment according to his holy institution;" that "by representing that sacrifice we send up, together with our prayers, an instrument of their graciousness and acceptance;" "we celebrate and exhibit the Lord's death in sacrament and symbol; and this is that great express, which, when the Church offers to God the Father, it obtains all those blessings which that sacrifice purchased:" "when men eat and drink the consecrated and blessed elements worthily, they receive Christ within them." I shall heap up no more testimony; for it is difficult to see how the real presence is to be denied by an Anglican, who turns to his Prayer Book, or to the great Doctors of his Church. And that my belief regarding the meaning of the protestation is not unfounded, I would have it remembered, that whilst Bishop Ridley protested against a *corporeal* presence, he did not mean "to remove that real presence of Christ's body in

his supper." Even the Romanist Milner confesses and proves that the Church of England holds the real presence.* And Hornyhold admits that "the doctrine of the Church of England expresses the real and substantial presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, as fully as any Catholic can do; for if verily and indeed be not the same as really and truly, and of as full force to exclude a mere figurative presence, I must confess I am yet wholly ignorant even of the signification of the most common words, &c." Bossuet affirms that the Anglicans are at liberty to "believe that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are really and substantially present in the bread and in the wine immediately after consecration."† We think therefore, that with such any array of witnesses we may assert that the Anglican Church teaches both the real presence, and a sacrifice, notwithstanding Mr. Northcote's insinuation to the contrary.

I will now leave this matter here, with this warning, that first, our own Church on the whole is more in accordance with the primitive mind than is the Roman; next, that the points, wherein the Roman is more accordant thereunto, than we are, are either unimportant (although good it may be, and desirable,) or are corruptions, which developed themselves in the Church at an early time.

I next proceed to Mr. Northcote's last test, Apostolicity; a question which for the force of his attack, had better have been left unmooted. And in considering this, I wish first of all to make a few observations on some errors in his statements both as regards the English Ordinal and the History of the Reformation

* Letter viii. to Prebendary.

† See these passages quoted by Mr. Palmer. "Treatise, &c." Part ii., cap. vii.

in this land; then to shew what seems to be the real amount of the regal supremacy in our Church; and that it is not greater than can find a parallel both in the ancient Catholic, and modern Roman Church.

At first starting Mr. Northcote tells us that Rome has practically given a decision as to the invalidity of our orders, and that "her experienced eye" has found out a flaw, which renders them null. How far her eye is more "experienced" than that of other Churches, matters not now, though it has been deceived more than once; but her conduct in reordaining our priests, seems to be nothing more than a measure of safety, to which she resorted in a case, which she thought might not be fully certain. It is really therefore no pronouncement at all, excepting so far as that "the experienced eye" of Rome cannot see quite clearly in the matter. And now comes the question of our ordinal in the days of Edward VI., which, Mr. Northcote's opinion notwithstanding, has been, we must be allowed to think, most ably and successfully defended by Courayer. Nor do we rest on his opinion alone; for had the appendix to Courayer been read, he would have found a letter written even by Bossuet himself, in which he plainly asserts that he finds no difficulty in the matter; and Mr. Palmer* shews that the learned Franciscan Walsh held the same opinion after the most careful examination, and that "Barnes the Benedictine went so far as to write a book to induce the Roman Patriarch to receive the English Church into his communion, and to justify us from the charge of schism and heresy." Does Mr. Northcote seriously think that there is any analogy between rejecting some ceremonies, believed to be unessential

* Orig. Lit., cap. xii., sec. 2, note n.

additions, and rejecting a formal profession of Faith? by what authority was the article of the necessity of these ceremonies ever "defined?" They were not even able to lay claim to the authority of antiquity; they were but things of yesterday, which had crept into the service by degrees, and rested on no authority recognised by the English Church. Mr. Northcote must well know that the very principle on which our Church proceeded was to remove all modern additions and corruptions, and to bring all things as near to primitive practice as she was able. It was on this account that she abolished all these idle ceremonies, as unauthorized, retaining however in her service amply sufficient words to shew her intention and her belief in Episcopacy, and using a fuller form of consecration even than that used by Rome herself.—Indeed Vasquez felt that the Roman form required a defence as not explicit enough, which deficiency he maintained was supplied by the prayers and ceremonies used in the rest of the service, they being explanatory of the intention of the Church. Those then who will turn to the Edwardine form of our ordinal, so much assailed, will find amply sufficient in the prayers, &c., of that service, to atone for all fancied deficiencies in the form of consecration, and abundant intimation of the intention of the Church. But our Church was desirous of approaching primitive purity, and believed that what in ancient times was sufficient, would be so for ever; and as for all these excrescences, we have yet to learn by what valid authority they were made essential. But independently of the opinion which he has ventured to give, Mr. Northcote has made some rather serious mistakes in his history. Before noticing these, I will premise that I do not feel called

upon to defend every word and deed of Henry VIII., or Queen Elizabeth, or even of the various Bishops of those days. High sounding phrases and stretches of authority in the Sovereign, and submission or want of remonstrance from the Bishops are not authoritative statements of the English Church. And the Church of Rome is the very last ever to admit such a criterion in her own case; she is ever appealing to authority, and throwing over inconvenient statements as being not authorized.* The Church must be judged by her authorised documents, and those of the Anglican speak with sufficient plainness, both as regards the Episcopacy and the regal supremacy. She was not bound to protest against words, or refuse submission to acts, which did not require her to destroy the character essential to her as a Church; nay, situated as she was in the perilous times of the Reformation, she was bound to take that course which was best calculated to preserve her from any interference in essential points, even though she thereby was obliged to submit to some things disadvantageous.

* I do not admit the validity of this plea in the case of Rome; a Church which pretends to such a strict and unviolated discipline, and which assails others for the want of it, has no right to defend herself when attacked through the writings of her Divines, by calling the passages objected to, unauthorised scholastic dogmas. If she thinks them objectionable, she is bound at once to restrain them or confess the weakness of her discipline—if she does not condemn them, the natural inference is that she approves, or at all events does not disapprove. Yet many of these so called scholastic tenets, are startling errors, even in the opinions of Romanists themselves. In fact the very plea, thus entered, is an implied confession of the erroneousness of the opinion, which requires such a plea; else why not boldly defend it? And hence this refuge of "scholastic tenets" is destruction to the Romish boast of a strict discipline not to be violated with impunity, and is totally opposed to the principles laid down by the Council of Trent. I do not mean to say that it is ever a fair argument to charge upon a Church the errors of her individual teachers; but I do say, that it is fair to use these errors as proofs of a want of proper discipline and perfect unity; and *then*, if this accusation be not admitted, to charge the errors upon the Church, which thus virtually adopts them as her own.

By her own authoritative documents, I repeat, must the Church of England be judged; so that in this question of the ordinal, we are not to consider what were the opinions of the framers of the new ordinal, but what was the opinion of the English Church as set forth on her own authority in convocation, and I think that few will be found to agree with Mr. Northcote, that "Episcopacy was retained only for form's sake; or at least with a very different design from that hitherto entertained by the Church, and rather as a civil than an ecclesiastical dignity." None can fairly read through the ordination service of King Edward's time without feeling that Episcopacy was retained for its own sake, as an important and essential part of the Church. Dean Prideaux says; "with us, as well as in the Church of Rome, there are always three Bishops present at the ordination of a Bishop, which all together, lay on their hands on the Bishop elect when ordained; and not only this circumstance, but many others in the administration of this office according to our ordinal, do as fully shew what order the person on whom they thus lay their hands, and pronounce the above-mentioned form of consecration over, is to be admitted to. The complex of the whole office shews it; for the person to be ordained or consecrated is presented to the metropolitan as one to be made a Bishop, he takes the oath of canonical obedience to the metropolitan as one to be made a Bishop, is examined or interrogated as one to be made a Bishop, is vested in the episcopal robes, and is ordained by a form never used but in the ordination of a Bishop; and all these together, with many other like circumstances in that office, too long all to be put down, are certainly sufficient to determine the words of the

form of the Episcopal office only, were there nothing in the words themselves to do it, as it is certain there is not in the form used by the Church of Rome to this purpose." The ordinal, called in question by Mr. Northcote, says in its preface, that there have "been from the Apostle's time these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; which officers (says the Church) were ever more had in such reverend estimation, that no man by his private authority might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same; and also by public prayer with imposition of hands, approved and admitted thereunto." Moreover separate offices were framed for these various orders, and in each office it was affirmed that divers orders were appointed by the Holy Ghost. Can all these things be fairly considered without drawing forth the unqualified admission that the English Church retained Episcopacy as a divine and essential institution.

Or if we go from the authoritative documents of the Church to the recorded opinions of those who were prominent in those days, I need only refer to the ninth chapter of Courayer's "Defence of the English Ordinations," where he proves from the recorded opinions of many Bishops and learned Doctors of the English Church in 1540—opinions embodied in the "Resolutions of several Bishops and Divines of some questions concerning the Sacraments," that, so far from Episcopacy being esteemed by them a thing to be laid aside at convenience, they almost unanimously agreed in laying down the orthodox doctrine concerning it, as fully as Mr. Northcote could desire. But we need not carry

the enquiry even so far as this, we need only take the opinions of those who were engaged in framing the new ordinal. Now there is reason to believe that Barlow was not employed in this duty at all; Cranmer indeed was, and his opinions were apparently, in 1540, far from being orthodox, so that Mr. Northcote has some very slight colour for his assertion concerning consecration having been previously affirmed to be not necessary. Yet even Cranmer's opinions at that time are matters of doubt, for he does not give his erroneous opinion with any confidence or certainty; his opinions, plainly set forth only three years previously, are strictly orthodox; and, what is still more, the opinions set forth by him strongly and plainly in 1543, and 1548, and 1551, assert a fully orthodox doctrine concerning Episcopacy. But it was not until 1549 that this new ordinal, so called in question, was taken in hand, and therefore even Cranmer had long before laid aside his heterodox notions (if he ever really held them) on this subject. For the others, who were engaged in framing the new ordinal, we need not fear to answer; inasmuch as so far as their opinions are known at all, they held a totally different belief concerning Episcopacy from that imputed to them by Mr. Northcote; and all of them who have recorded their opinions on the subject, have laid down the Catholic and orthodox doctrine. It is not now my intention to enter into the details of proof on this point, for this would be to swell these pages far beyond my proposed limits; nor is it necessary, for it has been already proved most convincingly by the Rev. E. C. Harrington, to whose "Postscript" I must refer those who seek a more detailed proof on this subject. I would further ask Mr. Northcote to read through the Bull of Pope Julius,

given in the Appendix to Courayer's Defence, and ask whether the observation there made upon it is not fully borne out by its contents? "The words of this Bull are distinct. The prelates ordained under Edward are not distinguished there from those ordained under Henry; but the validity of the ordination of these latter was not disputed; the only business was to reinstate them. As yet then, it was not believed at Rome, that Edward's Ritual had affected the essentials of ordination; nor do the degradations performed under Mary prove it any more, since the same conduct was observed with regard to the Bishops and Priests ordained under Henry," according to the old Romish rite. Practically also in Queen Mary's reign the same belief was shewn; Cardinal Pole and Bonner did not re-ordain those who had been ordained according to King Edward's Ritual; they only reconciled and had them admitted by the ordinary and re-habilitated them; Scory, who had been consecrated by this form now called in question, was restored by Bonner to his office without any fresh consecration; we surely therefore may believe that in those days no doubt was entertained as to the validity of our orders. Mr. Northcote refers to the injunction in Queen Mary's time, that those who were found worthy, should "receive that which was wanting to them, seeing that they were not yet ordered in very deed." This it must be remembered referred not to bishops only, for it was "touching such persons as were heretofore promoted to *any* orders after the new sort and fashion of orders." Yet we do not find any instances of re-ordaining; and moreover the order is to "supply what was wanting," which surely can hardly be stretched to mean, to wholly re-ordain. "The general practice of England will, I am confident,"

says Elrington, "be found to have been conformable to the Bull of Pope Julius, and to have consisted not in re-ordaining, but in re-habilitating. We have already seen what Bonner's conduct was, and he surely will not be reckoned over-liberal in his sentiments. An examination of the diocese of Norwich did not produce a single instance of re-ordination; and, what is decisive on the question, Cardinal Pole's registry for the diocese of Canterbury affords also no instance of re-ordination." The thirteenth chapter of Courayer's Dissertation, is worth reading upon this point; from which I will extract only his general deduction. "It is impossible, in order to prove the invalidity of the ordinations made under Edward, to make any use of the re-ordinations prescribed in the reign of Mary, for two reasons. The first, because they were not uniform on this head, and because there was a time when they thought them valid, as appears from the ordinances of Queen Mary, from the visitation articles of Bonner, and still more from the plenary power granted by Julius III. to his Legate, Cardinal Pole, and the offers made by Pius VI. to Queen Elizabeth. The second, that they equally charged with invalidity, the consecrations of bishops made under Henry VIII. after his schism, as we see by the degradations of Bishops Latimer, Ridley, and Farrer, who had been consecrated according to the Roman Pontifical, and whom they were contented to degrade from the priesthood only, on the pretext that they were not bishops. But all agree now, that these bishops were validly consecrated, and that their consecration could not without error, be taxed with invalidity. It is not surprising therefore, that the same Divines were mistaken about Edward's ordinations; and their opinions

on this subject, or rather the re-ordinations made on such authority cannot even serve as an antecedent probability towards the decision of this question."

Mr. Northcote further calls it "false to plead that the exercise of supremacy by Queen Elizabeth in depriving the Catholic Bishops was no more than that of her predecessors in depriving Protestant Bishops." And his first reason for such assertion is that "Mary was supported by the authority of the Holy See." But it behoves Mr. Northcote to first of all shew us that this was really any valid support at all; on the contrary, we affirm it to be an especial reason for invalidating all her proceedings, even if they were otherwise regular; for the convocation of England had deliberately rejected that authority, and declared it to have no force. It was contrary to the ecclesiastical canons of the Church of England, canons still in full force, and which therefore Queen Mary, and all who aided her, were violating; her justification must be carried further back, and it must be clearly shewn that the Pope had any rightful authority over our Church, that the English Church was not rightfully independent of his rule and at liberty to judge for herself. Unless the Pope could make good his claim of supremacy, the canons of the English Church were valid, and therefore Mary acted schismatically in relying on "the authority of the Holy See," and all the Bishops whom she appointed were schismatics and rebels against their Church for admitting such an authority, in defiance of the canons.

But was Mary thus supported by the authority of the Holy See? The first act almost of her reign was to restore Bonner, Tunstall, Day, and Heath, who had been deprived in the former reign—I pass no judgment on

their former deprivation or its regularity, I only say that these prelates were restored independently of any authority from Rome, by the sole authority of the crown, or by a commission mostly composed of laymen.

Soon after this followed the committal of several Bishops to prison, and other evident signs of the storm about to burst upon the Reformed Clergy.—Hence mere regard for their own safety compelled many of them to fly beyond the sea; amongst the rest, the Bishops of Bath and Wells and of Exeter. This was followed up by Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, forcing the mass and other Romish practices and doctrines on the Universities, and ejecting many of the members, all on his own single authority. The Parliament also repealed the statutes authorizing the reformed services and practices, and even ordering the liturgies which had been abolished, to be restored. The Queen herself had indeed at the beginning of her reign made an extreme stretch of her royal authority, and forbidden preaching except by her license, used the abolished Roman ceremonial at her coronation, the mass at the opening of parliament, (in which instance we may enquire what was meant by the treatment experienced by the Bishops of Lincoln and Hereford at that time?) and given other unmistakeable signs of her intention. Yet she refused not the title given to her predecessors, and styles herself, in calling the convocation together, "supreme head on earth of the Church of England." Whilst all these things are progressing the Queen seems fully contented to do without "the authority of the Holy See."—She eventually consents to the advice of Gardiner, and obtains the detention of the Papal Legate abroad for several months; and when she writes to him, it seems as much to inform him

of her own intentions as to ask any advice. Nay, the slight admonitions which he did give were but little heeded; for, says Collier, "notwithstanding the Queen's good opinion of the Cardinal, she did not govern her affairs wholly by his advice. She was convinced by Gardiner the reconciling the Kingdom to the See of Rome was pushed too fast by the Cardinal, and that the marriage with Spain ought to be first despatched. The Emperor concurred with these measures, and thus Pole was still detained in Flanders." In February, 1554, the Queen had several articles drawn up and sent to all the bishops, commanding them to restore the canons formerly in use, provided not against the laws of the realm; to abolish the oath of regal supremacy; to restore old ceremonies, fasts, processions, &c.; the use of the Latin tongue in the services, the mass, and many other things which the Church of England had discarded. Nay, the bishops were even enjoined by the Queen, thus constituting herself a judge of the ordinal, to make up what was wanting in those who were "heretofore promoted to any orders, after the new sort and fashion of orders." Now all these things were done long before any authority came from Rome to uphold them; and though the Queen might very likely have acted by the advice of her bishops, yet nevertheless the acts were those of the Crown. "I should desire to know," says Twysden,* "how the mass without any intermission was restored by Queen Mary: for it is manifest she returned to the use of it immediately after her brother's death, and yet Cardinal Pole reconciled not this kingdom to Rome till the thirtieth of November, above a year after; and then too on such conditions only as the par-

* Vindication, cap. vi. 10.

liament approved: during which space she, as Queen, gave directions to the ordinaries how they should carry themselves in several particulars; which as it is probably she did by the advice of her bishops; so there is no reason to condemn the like proceedings in Edward VI." These extreme irregularities might well make us imagine that little authority was sought from Rome for depriving the bishops; and we have already seen that some were deprived and others reinstated by the Queen immediately on her accession. And even had she not proceeded to positive acts of deprivation, yet her restoration of popish usages and the determination shewn to enforce them, of itself amounted to virtually the same thing, by compelling those whose consciences would not allow them to submit, either to fly or undergo persecution. However this was not all: Archbishop Cranmer was committed to prison towards the end of 1554, and his See declared void, without any ecclesiastical enquiry, and afterwards administered by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury; but in March, 1554, two Royal commissions were sent forth, composed of bishops indeed, but nevertheless Royal commissions, for depriving seven bishops; on which Collier remarks, "The reader may observe, these bishops, excepting Bush, were all turned out upon the strength of the regale: for though the sentence of deprivation was pronounced by bishops, and none but those of that order are named in the commission, yet they acted purely upon the Queen's authority, as appears both by the instrument and the Canterbury register." And the Sees thus vacant were immediately filled; but what authority can be pleaded from Rome for all this I must confess my total ignorance, for the Papal Legate was all this time prevented from coming to exercise the

authority of the Holy See by the especial request of Queen Mary herself; nor did he come into England until the end of the November following.

How then can Mr. Northcote justify his assertion that, in depriving these bishops, "Mary was supported by the authority of the Holy See?" or that "all the sentences of deposition issued in her reign were pronounced by bishops, and by them only?" Another reason assigned is that the clergy were "notoriously guilty of a breach of vows, or were such as only pretended to hold their bishoprics by letters patent of King Edward VI. during good behaviour." With regard to the former point, I would only remind Mr. Northcote that the English Church had sanctioned the marriage of the Clergy, and done away with the necessity of celibacy,* so that probably those, who married, esteemed themselves as absolved from their vows, and at liberty to do in the matter as they pleased by the authority of their Church. Moreover were this a valid ground for deprivation and ejection, it would be worth enquiring how many of the Romish clergy were not liable to the same treatment. "The greatest blemish of this kind drawn upon the clergy before the Reformation, was their entertaining women under the character of concubines; for this practice they had a licence from their bishop. This liberty had an unreputable appearance, to strangers especially, and had the engagement been no better than the name, would have deserved the hardest censure. But these women, notwithstanding they were somewhat coarsely distinguished, were for the most part their wives, though the canons which forbad the clergy to marry, would not allow them the credit of being so called: the bishops

* Article xxxi. A.D. 1552.

who were well acquainted with their conduct, gave them licenses for this purpose, and consequently dispensed with their vow." "There be no small agreements that some bishops and the best of the clergy living within the memory of man did continue; and elsewhere divers of the clergy lived secretly with wives, &c."* Further, as Mr. Palmer says, "It is disputed even now among Roman theologians, whether there is any obligation to celibacy from any vow." Ligorio says, "An hac obligatio sit immediate ex præcepto ecclesiæ, vel mediate per votum ordinatorum? Utraque est probabilis ex eodem, cap. 9. Trident. Prima sententia, quam tenent Mastrius, Bosco, Herinx, &c., apud Holmann, p. 268, n. 103, ac Scotus, Palaus, Valent. et Aversa, apud Salmant. cap. 6, n. 28, (qui cum Sanchez merito probabilem putant) dicit, quod non ex voto, sed ex solâ ecclesiæ lege ordinati in sacris teneantur ad castitatem." Let it then be considered that this vow of celibacy was one often most burdensome and dangerous; that it was violated constantly without censure, yea, even with connivance; that it was not a divine institution, but imposed in later days; that even Romish theologians dispute and doubt its obligation, further than as mere obedience to the Church's injunctions; and that the English Church had declared the lawfulness of the marriage of the clergy. Let all this be considered, and little cause will appear for depriving the bishops on such a ground as this. As regards their tenure of their Bishoprics and King Edward's Letters patent, if this had been a sufficient reason for their deprivation, then should Bonner himself have been deprived; for "this bishop it is certain took out such an instrument

* Collier. Part ii., B. iv., 262.

in the beginning of King Edward's reign. The commission sets forth that Bonner had made application to King Edward for an authority to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction." But it is abundantly evident from the inconsistency and the partiality in the various deprivations that all these matters were merely put forward to serve as pretexts, in order to get rid of bishops likely to be troublesome to the Papal rule, or rather I should say, to the Queen's religion.* Moreover, the bishops taking out such a commission, could not affect their Episcopal character and rights—the essential rights of Episcopacy were not conveyed nor could they be taken away by the Sovereign; and though from worldly policy or mistaken motives, some bishops might choose to prostrate their office and keep their rights in abeyance that would not, and could not prevent, but that those rights were inherent in them still, and would be conveyed by them to those on whom they should lay hands. So that if these bishops yielded to the crown an excess of power, they yielded what they could not yield; for no acts of their own could convey from themselves to the crown a right or power inherent in their office, and in that alone. The good behaviour clause was really a mere nullity. And the whole account of Queen Mary's deprivations is this; that they were purposed by the Queen to overthrow the faith and usages synodically approved by the Church of England, and to restore an usurped authority to a foreign bishop, which was contrary to the canons and laws of the Ancient Church, and had been formally and synodically cast off by the

* Gardiner had written and published a book against the Pope, in Henry VIII's reign; to which Bonner had written a preface, treating the Pope with rough language. How then came these bishops to be so zealous for the Pope, so trusted and so caressed in Queen Mary's time?

Church of England; and they were carried into effect partly by the Government, partly by a few bishops acting only on the Royal authority, contrary to the existing laws of that Church in which they held office. And the whole reconciliation with Rome was not a synodical act, but perfectly irregular and without authority, and only preserved from synodical opposition by getting rid of the clergy likely to oppose the proceeding.—Queen Elizabeth on the other hand did indeed place herself in what Romanists term "an attitude of defiance to the Holy See," that is to say, she reversed all the irregular proceedings of her sister, acting on the existing authoritative laws of the English Church, which had been set at nought in Mary's reign, and therefore in strict accordance with them, re-abolished the dominion of the Papacy in England, restored the worship and discipline which the English Church had formally sanctioned, and tendered the oath of the regal supremacy to the clergy. When these latter refused to take this oath they were disobeying not only the Queen, but the laws of their Church, and were therefore on this ground justly deposed. There were moreover other most just reasons for depriving them, as they had set the decrees of their Church at defiance, used a discipline and doctrine which she had abjured, intruded into the sees of other bishops unlawfully deposed by Mary, and committed many other schismatical acts. Indeed, unless Mr. Northcote can shew that England had no right to refuse the supremacy of the Pope, Mary must appear in the light of a schismatic, and her acts be counted as schismatical, whilst Elizabeth on the contrary, was guided in her proceeding by the existing laws of the Church. The former acted solely on the regale against the Church,

the latter obeyed the Church instead of merely using the regale. And consequently Queen Mary's exercise of the supremacy was more excessive and violent than her successor's. Here terminates Mr. Northcote's enquiry concerning the validity of orders; but before leaving this question, I will translate Mr. Palmer's excellent summary of Queen Elizabeth's proceedings.* "The bishops consecrated in Queen Elizabeth's reign were not intruders, because the Sees to which they were ordained, were already vacant, either by death, or by the lawful expulsion of those who had previously occupied them. The latter were justly expelled, because they were hostile to the ancient rights and independence of the Crown and the Church, disloyal and disobedient to their Sovereign and the Holy Canons, illegitimately ordained or intruded into Sees, and heretical in their doctrines. The Crown had a right to expel them, because it was bound to enforce the canons, the liberties of the Church, and its own rights; and all the Catholic Bishops, who could act freely, gave their consent and approbation. The vacant sees were filled up by the appointment of orthodox pastors, who were all canonically consecrated by their primate; and the divine mission, the holy orthodox apostolical faith, which they possessed, have descended through the long line of their illustrious successors even to the present day. Hence the mission of the orthodox bishops and clergy is beyond all doubt. They can prove a continual possession of the Churches they now hold. They, and they alone, can trace their ordinations through all the ancient Saints and worthies of the British and Irish Church, to the Apostles Peter and Paul. They alone can trace an

* Origines Liturgicæ. Cap. xii., sec. v.

unbroken line of prelates filling all the dioceses within this realm. They alone can prove that their predecessors and themselves have vindicated the divine and apostolical liberties of the Catholic Church, against the encroachment and usurpation of foreign patriarchs. They alone are, and can style themselves, Bishops 'by the grace of God,' and not 'by the grace of the Roman See.' They are not the 'vicars,' deputies, or delegates of a foreign prelate, but vicars of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

I pass on to the question of spiritual jurisdiction, and first of the mission of St. Augustine, by St. Gregory; on which however Mr. Palmer and Archbishop Bramhall shall speak for me. And first the learned prelate who thus writes.*

"Peradventure it may be urged that Gregory the great, who by his ministers was the first converter of the English nation, about the six hundreth year of our Lord, did thereby acquire to himself and his successors, a patriarchal authority and power over England for the future. We do with all due thankfulness to God, and honourable respect to his memory, acknowledge that that blessed Saint was the chief instrument under God, to hold forth the first light of saving truth to the English nation, who did formerly sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, whereby he did more truly merit the name of great, than by possessing the chair of St. Peter. And therefore whilst the sometimes flourishing, now poor persecuted, Church of England shall have any being 'Semper honos nomenque suum laudesque manebunt.'

"But whether this benefit did entitle St. Gregory and his successors to the patriarchate of all or any part of the British Islands, deserves a further consideration.

* "Just Vindication, &c." Cap. ix.

"I. Consider that at that time, and until this day, half of Britain itself, and two third parts of the Britannic Islands did remain in the possession of the Britons, or Scottish and Irish, who still continued Christians, and had their bishops and protarchs or patriarchs of their own, from whom we do derive in part our Christianity and holy orders and privileges. Without all controversy, the conversion of the Saxons by St. Gregory, could not prejudice the just liberties of them or of their successors.

"II. Consider that the half of Britain, which was conquered and possessed by the Saxons, was not solely and altogether peopled by the Saxons. A world of British Christians did remain and inhabit among the conquerors. For we do not find, either that the Saxons did go about to extirpate the British nation, or compel them to turn renegades from their religion, or so much as demolish their Churches; but contented themselves to chase away persons of eminency and parts and power, whom they had reason to suspect and fear; and made use of vulgar persons and spirits for their own advantage. This is certain, that Britain being an island whither there is no access by land, all those who were transported, or could have been transported by sea on such a sudden, could not of themselves alone, in probability of reason, have planted or peopled the sixth part of so much land, as was really possessed by the Saxons. And therefore we need not wonder if Queen Bertha, a Galloise and a Christian, did find a congregation of Christians at Canterbury to join with her in her religion, and a Church called St. Martin's builded to her hand; and stood in need of Lethargus, a bishop, to order the affairs of Christian Religion, before ever

St. Austin set foot upon English ground. Neither did the British want their Churches in other places also, as appears by that commission which the King did give to Austin, (among other things) to repair the Churches that were decayed. These poor subdued persons had as much right to their ancient privileges, as the rest of the unconquered Britons.

"III. Consider, that all that part of Britain which was both conquered and inhabited by the Saxons, was not one entire monarchy, but divided into seven distinct kingdoms, which were not so suddenly converted to the Christian faith, all at once, but in long tract of time, long after St. Gregory slept with his Fathers, upon several occasions by several persons. It was Kent and some few adjacent counties that was converted by Austin. It is true that Ethelbert, King of Kent, after his own conversion, did endeavour to have planted the Christian faith both in the kingdoms of Northumberland and the East Angles, with fair hopes of good success for a season. But alas! it wanted root. Within a short time both Kings and Kingdoms apostated from Christ, and forsook their religion. The kingdoms of the West Saxons and of the South Saxons, under Kingils, their King, who did unite the heptarchy into a monarchy, were converted by the preaching of Berinus, an Italian, by the persuasions of Oswald, King of Northumberland. Oswald, King of Northumberland, was baptized in Scotland, and religion luckily planted in that kingdom by Aidan, a Scottish Bishop. Penda, King of Mercia, was converted and christened by Finanus, successor of Aidan, by the means of a marriage with a Christian Princess of the Royal Family of Northumberland. Sigibert, King of the East Angles, in whose days, and

by whose means, religion took root among the East Saxons, was converted and christened in France. All these Saxons, which were converted by Britons or Scots, may as justly plead for their old immunities, as the Britons themselves. We acknowledge St. Gregory to have been the first that did break the ice; and yet we see how small a portion of the inhabitants of the British islands do owe their conversion to Rome; in probability, not a tenth part.

"IV. Consider, that the conversion of a nation to the Christian faith, is a good ground in equity, all other circumstances concurring, why they should rather submit themselves, or a general council assign them, to that see, that converted them, than to any other patriarchate, as was justly pleaded in the case between the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople, about the right of jurisdiction over the Bulgarians. But the conversion of a nation is no ground at all to invest their converter presently with patriarchal authority over them, or any ecclesiastical superiority; especially where too great a distance of place doth render such jurisdiction useless and burdensome; and most especially where it cannot be done without prejudice to a former owner, thrust out of his just right merely by the power of the sword, (as the British primates were) or to the subjecting of a free nation to a foreign prelate, without or beyond their own consent. In probability of reason the Britons owed their first conversion to the Eastern Church, as appeareth by their accord with them in baptismal rites and the observation of Easter; yet never were subject to any Eastern patriarch. Sundry of our British and English bishops have converted foreign nations, yet never pretended to any jurisdiction over them.

"V. Consider that whatever title or right St. Gregory did acquire, or might have acquired by his piety and deserts towards the English nation, it was personal, and could not descend from him to such successors, who both forfeited it many ways, and quickly, within four or five years after his death, quitted their patriarchate, and set a higher title to a spiritual monarchy on foot, whilst the most part of England remained yet Pagan, when Pope Boniface did obtain of Phocas, the Emperor, an usurping Pope from an usurping Emperor, to be universal Bishop."

So much writes the Bishop of Armagh, who also shews reason, why even if the Popes ever had been patriarchs, they would have lost their right over us; patriarchal power being not of divine right, but of human institution, and therefore admitting abrogation. Now the Popes quitted their claim of being patriarchs, and challenged the title and power of universal Bishops, two things not consistent with each other. As Bramhall says, "to claim a power paramount and sovereign monarchical royalty over the Church, is implicitly, and in effect, to disclaim a patriarchal aristocratical dignity." They forfeited it also by their rebellion against general councils, and setting at nought the decrees of the Church Catholic, and by their abuses, cruelties, rapacity and disloyal practices. The power too was justly transferred at the will of the nation, particularly when the Papacy was claiming not only spiritual, but temporal jurisdiction over the whole earth. This whole question is fully discussed by the Archbishop in his Vindication, and to that I must refer those who would need more; I pass on to the testimony of Mr. Palmer.

"We turn to the history of the early church to trace

its sentiments on this point. Dr. Wiseman will not deny that Palladius and Patrick were commissioned by Pope Cœlestinus to preach the Gospel in Ireland, and that the conversion of that nation was the result; and yet the See of Rome acquired no patriarchal jurisdiction over Ireland in consequence. From the time of Cœlestinus, in 430, to the twelfth century, the Irish Church retained its independence. Its bishops and metropolitans were appointed without reference to the See of Rome; they were not summoned to its patriarchal synods. Appeals from their decisions were not carried to Italy. Not even a vicar of the Roman See was appointed in Ireland. In short, there is no evidence that the Bishops of Rome had any sort of patriarchal jurisdiction over the Church of Ireland, for six or seven centuries after it had been founded by missionaries from Rome.

"In the third century, when Christianity had made but little progress in France, the Bishop of Rome sent into that country several bishops, who fixed their sees in various parts of the country, and preached the Gospel there. Did this invest the Bishop of Rome with the patriarchal jurisdiction in France? No: the metropolitans and bishops of that country remained for ages afterwards independent of the See of Rome. They were not ordained by the Popes, nor summoned to their patriarchal synods, nor did they permit appeals to Rome. It was not until after the seventh or eighth century that they became really subject to Rome.

"The conduct of the popes themselves plainly shews that they did not recognise any right of patriarchal jurisdiction, as flowing from the conversion of heathen nations.

"The Bulgarians, a barbarous and heathen nation, had subjugated the Christian provinces of Epirus, Thessaly, and Dardania, forming part of the ancient civil diocese of Illyricum; when in the latter part of the ninth century, their King, influenced by the long prevalence of famine, by the exhortation of his sister, who had been converted to Christianity at Constantinople, and of two Greek monks, named Theodore Couphara and Methodius, embraced the Christian faith, and sent to the Emperor of Constantinople for a bishop, who on his arrival in Bulgaria, baptized the King. This prince subsequently exhorted his subjects to become Christians, and accordingly they were baptized by Greek priests. This occurred in the year 865, soon after which the King of Bulgaria sent to the King of Germany to ask for a bishop and priests to assist in the work of evangelizing his people. He addressed a similar request to Pope Nicholas I., who eagerly availed himself of the opportunity to send two Italian Bishops into Bulgaria, who prevailed on the King to banish the Greek missionaries who had first preached the Gospel there and baptized the inhabitants. From this time the popes claimed jurisdiction over Bulgaria, without paying the slightest regard to the prior claim of the See of Constantinople to the honour of having converted this people. Indeed the subsequent refusal of Ignatius and Photius, patriarchs of Constantinople, to relinquish their jurisdiction over Bulgaria to Rome, was the principal cause of disputes between those patriarchal thrones. Thus it appears that the popes rejected in the case of the Bulgarians, that plea for jurisdiction founded on conversion, which their adherents now so frequently advance to establish their claims over England.

"But if we examine this case a little closer, it will furnish a still more evident justification of the Church of England. The Roman pontiffs based their claim to jurisdiction over Bulgaria on the fact, that Illyricum, which the heathen Bulgarians had subdued, had *formerly* been subject to the See of Rome; and they considered this claim valid, although the See of Constantinople had subsequently acquired jurisdiction over Illyricum, to the exclusion of that of the Roman pontiffs. The subjugation of those provinces by a heathen nation and the conversion of that nation by Greek missionaries made no alteration in the rights of the pontiffs in their own opinion. Now this applies exactly to the case of Britain. Subject to its own metropolitans for several centuries, it had been afterwards subdued by the Pagan Saxons. But this invasion, the subsequent conversion of the invaders by the missionaries of Rome, and the temporary acquisition of jurisdiction in England by the papacy, did not impair the original rights of the English Churches and metropolitans. Their claim always remained in its full force, and they were entitled to assert that claim whenever a proper opportunity presented itself.

"Several other instances of the same disregard of the Roman pontiffs for prior occupation might be pointed out. What has been said, however, will suffice to shew that neither the Catholic Church generally, nor the Roman pontiffs in particular, have ever acknowledged the principle that any patriarch or bishop who may have been instrumental in converting the heathen, acquires a perpetual right of jurisdiction for his see over the Churches so founded."*

* Episcopacy Vindicated. Sec. xiii.

I trust these extracts are sufficient to dissolve Mr. Northcote's great difficulty of St. Augustine's mission, though it seems almost sufficient to answer that the question is not concerning patriarchal power, but universal jurisdiction; as the Papacy founds its claim on the supposed divine right of the successors of St. Peter. Nor could St. Gregory make a grant of metropolitan power to St. Augustine. He might send him as a missionary, and might advise and aid him in all ways to the utmost of his power. But Canterbury possesses the metropolitical chair, not from any grant of St. Gregory, but from the consent and constitution of the English Church. In fact, St. Gregory's directions were as little followed in the matter as well could be; "we may observe," says Collier,* "that Gregory the Great's regulation, 'in his letter to Augustine, the monk, had slept and been disregarded a great while; for this pope gives Augustine the primacy of all Britain as a personal privilege, he likewise designed London for the metropolitical see for the southern part of the island; and that after the death of Augustine, the Archbishops of London and York should be independent of each other, and have precedency according to the priority of their consecration. The Archbishop of York was likewise to have twelve suffragans under him when the country was converted. But this scheme of Pope Gregory's never took effect, but was laid aside in almost every particular. For as to the northern parts, the See of York was removed not long after, to Holy Island, and when the jurisdiction was brought back, and the metropolitical power revived, those archbishops fell always very much short of the superintendency of twelve dioceses besides their own.

* Vol. i., page 232. Ed. 1845.

And then as to the southern part of the island, London was never advanced to the archiepiscopal dignity; that privilege was annexed to the See of Canterbury where it has all along continued; I say all along, for the short encroachment of the See of Lichfield is not worth the mentioning."

Too much delay has already been made upon a question which is in truth no difficulty at all, and we must therefore pass on to that which follows next in Mr. Northcote's letter, viz., the regal supremacy; and perhaps on no point has the English Church been so constantly and so grievously misrepresented as this. In the letter now under consideration we are told, that a principle was then admitted, which was "a distinct relinquishment of all claim to authority as derived from the Apostles, and an acceptance of it at the hands of a power altogether different." And how is this strong assertion proved? by any authoritative synodical acts of the English Church? No; but by the opinions of lawyers, the words and acts of sovereigns, and the proceedings of bishops acting individually; the former of these being positively no proof whatever, but rather a kind of evidence which one would at first sight reject, as being likely to be biassed entirely in one direction, and proceeding from persons little likely to form a correct opinion on ecclesiastical matters. The second evidence also is equally objectionable, for nothing would be more natural than for the regal power to endeavour to extend itself to the utmost, and often for the Church to submit under trying and perilous circumstances, and to yield points not actually essential, in order to preserve what was essential, and from a hope of being soon able to recover herself. Nor could the acts and submission of

bishops do anything more than involve themselves in serious blame. So long as they were ordained apostolically, so long as they sought ordination not at the hands of the king but of the bishops, they would be validly consecrated, and be true bishops possessed of full episcopal power, and able to transmit it to their successors, even though themselves might use it but little, or prostrate it to the throne, or assert that they derived that power wholly from the king. Such opinions would indeed be heterodox, and such conduct worthy of blame; but this heterodoxy and blame would attach only to the individuals, not to their Church nor to their successors. Mr. Northcote therefore must prove his case from better testimony; yet this he will find difficult; for, as I have previously shewn, and will presently endeavour to shew still further, the formal doctrine of the English Church was then, as now, viz., that episcopacy was a divine institution, that its powers were derived through apostolical succession, and that bishops alone could ordain bishops. The principle therefore, if admitted at all, against which Mr. Northcote inveighs, was admitted not by the Church of England, but only by bishops acting in their individual character, in compliance probably with what they deemed the urgent necessity of the case. So that even they would not be without excuse, nor of necessity be heterodox in their opinions, but only yielding from a fear of greater danger to their Church if they held out.

Further let it be remembered that those points, on which Mr. Northcote so much relies to prove his case, will apply not only to the reformed bishops. Bonner himself, as I have before mentioned, applied to King Edward for a renewal of his letters patent, yet we are

never told that he on that account had a defective title, or believed that he derived all his jurisdiction from the crown, and in no way from the apostles. Yet if the taking out these commissions, the submitting to these requirements of the crown, were sufficient to destroy the episcopal character, then assuredly Bonner was no more a bishop than the rest, and no more capable of episcopal functions. The same may be said of other bishops also, whom nevertheless the Romanists would feel themselves bound to defend. So that Mr. Northcote attempts to prove too much; for the Romish and the reformed bishops of that time must, on this point at all events, stand or fall together. One cannot indeed but admire the boldness of Queen Mary's commission who deprived three fellow bishops for holding their sees on the same title on which themselves had consented to hold their own. In fact all the greatest causes of complaint, given to the Pope by England, were afforded by the Romanists themselves, as Archbishop Bramhall observes,*—"This is undeniably true that the secession and subtraction of obedience was not made by our reformers, or by any of their friends or favourers, but by their capital enemies and persecutors, by zealots of the Roman religion." The archbishop proceeds in proof to shew, that the universities and the national synod publicly denied and threw off the Roman jurisdiction with free and unanimous consent, that the Romanists first made the King head of the Church; and all this at a time when Henry VIII. was no friend to the Protestants. "But to clear this point home, there needs no more but to view the order of the statutes made concerning religion and ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the reign of that

* "Just Vindication." Chap. iii.

King. The act for no person to be cited out of his own diocese, except in certain cases; the act prohibiting all appeals out of England, to the court of Rome; the act for the submission of the clergy to the King; the act for payment for first fruits to the crown; an act for exoneration from all exactions of the court of Rome; the act declaring the King to be supreme Head of the Church of England; an act against popish bulls, faculties, and dispensations; and the act for utterly extinguishing the usurped authority of the Roman Bishop, were all, or the most of them, enacted before the eight and twentieth year of Henry VIII. And if my notes fail me not, (for we are chased from our books,) they were all received and established in Ireland the very same year, the Lord Grey being then the Lord Deputy of Ireland. All this while there were no thoughts of any Reformation; all this while the Protestants found little grace from King Henry; nor indeed throughout his whole reign ordinarily."....."So then Henry VIII. at the time of his secession from Rome, and long after, even so long as he lived, was neither friend nor favourer of the ensuing Reformation, nor ordinarily of Protestants in their persons; as may yet more manifestly appear by that cruel statute of the six articles; which he made after all this, in the one and thirtieth year of his reign, as a trap to catch the lives of the poor Protestants; a law both writ in blood, and executed in blood. But suppose that Henry VIII. had been a friend to Protestants, what shall we say to all the orders in the kingdom? What shall we say to the synods, to the universities, to the four and twenty bishops, and nine and twenty abbots, who consented to this act? Were all these schismatics? Were Heath, Bonner, Tunstall, Gardiner,

Stokesley, Thurleby, &c., all schismatics? If they were, then schismatics were the greatest opposers of the Reformation, the greatest enemies of the Protestants, and the greatest pillars and upholders of the Roman religion. These were they that granted the supremacy to King Henry VIII; Archbishop Warham told him it was his right to have it before the Pope. These were they that preached up the supremacy of the King at St. Paul's Cross, and defended his supremacy in printed books. These consented to the Acts of Parliament for his supremacy, and the extinguishing of the power of the Roman Bishop in England. These were they who helped to make the oath of supremacy, and took it themselves, and all others of any note throughout England, except only Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, who were in prison, before it was enacted, for opposing the King's marriage, and the succession of his children to the crown, after it was ordained in parliament." The archbishop then further goes on to prove on the express testimony of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, how "all sorts of people are agreed with us upon this point with most steadfast consent, that no manner of person, bred or brought up in England, hath ought to do in Rome." Very much more might be added to all this, but what is here set down is more than ample to shew that those very bishops, whom Queen Mary restored and favoured, and who presumed to judge their fellow bishops, were, on the point of yielding up their spiritual jurisdiction, in the same case with those who were condemned.

But further I maintain, that even the individual bishops did not admit this new principle which Mr. Northcote charges upon the English Church. Henry VIII.

issues letters of inhibition forbidding, by his supreme ecclesiastical authority, all exercise of jurisdiction to the bishops and archbishops. Here is Mr. Northcote's first point; though what he really expects to prove from it one does not easily see, further than that it shews King Henry to have been ready to take all advantage of his supremacy, and stretch it to the uttermost; the same might be shewn by numberless other of his acts, and by numerous Acts of Parliament, quite as well as by the instance which Mr. Northcote has selected; nor do I pretend to defend all the doings of those times, or to approve of the excessive stretching of the regale; I need only maintain that nothing was done or submitted to, which for ever deprived the bishops of their inherent episcopal rights. And the question moreover to be considered is not how King Henry acted, but how the clergy submitted. The occasion of these "letters of inhibition" was a remarkable one. Cromwell had been appointed vicar-general, with power and authority to visit, in the king's name, all the monasteries, and with precedency, as the king's representative, over all the bishops and archbishops. It was in consequence of this visitation that the "letters of inhibition" were issued, causing a temporary suspension of episcopal jurisdiction, a visitation which the King assumed himself to have the right to make by virtue of his supremacy, and which he regarded as of the same force, whether made in person or by proxy. The commission most certainly was extraordinarily wide in its terms; the only points of episcopal rights not intrenched upon, were those of a purely ministerial character. Now that the King and the bishops felt and thought very differently concerning his right to do all this, is pretty plain from the commissioners

reasons for persuading the King to continue the inhibition, and their motives for so doing. Collier expressly says that they were apprehensive the bishops would "use their interest to get the inhibition of their jurisdiction taken off." And their second reason against yielding to the bishops on this point is,—"that in case the bishops had always enjoyed this jurisdiction without any interruption, they would *(as they now do upon the matter)* have presumed they had received their authority from some other fountain than the King's highness. These visitors therefore look upon it as a prudential expedient to suspend their jurisdiction for some time, that by this means they may be *forced* to confess their authority flows from the King." I scarcely see how words could shew more plainly that the bishops *denied* that principle, which Mr. Northcote asserts was admitted, viz., that they derived their jurisdiction from the crown. Why then submit? In the first place it may be answered that only Cranmer submitted to the regal power, the others submitted to their metropolitan, because it was the archbishop who inhibited for a time the exercise of jurisdiction by the rest, so that they might have acted only on canonical principles, whilst Cranmer might have submitted either from policy, or it may be from principle, or perhaps from both. But suppose that all the bishops had submitted to this exercise of the regale directly, and not through their metropolitan; it would still be no recognition of a new principle, as to the source of their jurisdiction, especially when we have the words I just now quoted, to shew their real opinion. With so uncertain and arbitrary a monarch as Henry VIII., a King so determined and so difficult to keep in tolerable order, in such times

as were those days, and when the Church had a most difficult course to steer, the bishops might well think it better to yield for a time, so long as nothing was done subversive of the Church and its faith, rather than by opposition to bring upon themselves and their Church persecution, and endless toil and misery, perhaps utter destruction. In fact the bishops seem to have submitted because they found themselves obliged to do so, or to encounter still greater perils, not because they considered that the King could take from them a jurisdiction, which they knew to be inherent in their office. Similarly Cranmer had a license from the King for his visitation, which is Mr. Northcote's second proof; but it is evident from the very account of that visitation that he took this license, in order to be enabled to legally enforce what he ecclesiastically judged. The next objection has puzzled me greatly, and I cannot help thinking either that Mr. Northcote has fallen into an error or written loosely. He proceeds,—"In fact, the bishops had already taken out a commission in the following terms," which he proceeds to give. I cannot find any such commission *already* given: the first which I can find is one given *after* these proceedings just considered, relaxing the inhibition and permitting the bishops to resume their jurisdiction. This does indeed commence with the words cited. Moreover it is a most extraordinary document, and though it acknowledges some divine jurisdiction as inherent in the episcopate, yet it is apparently but little which is so allowed. But it must be remembered that this was a document emanating only from the crown, not sworn to by the bishops as containing truths, but a mere declaration of the king's, setting forth his own opinion, and therefore in no way requiring

a protest from the bishops: moreover it may be that the king only intended it as a legal permission to exercise an inherent right; at all events the bishops may have thought it but so to regard it. Mr. Palmer speaks thus of these various commissions granted in the reigns of both Henry VIII. and Edward VI. "However wide and high sounding the terms of this commission appear, I contend that it does not necessarily convey an heterodox meaning; for it may be understood to confer ecclesiastical jurisdiction not in foro conscientiæ and as operating internally, but as externally and legally coercive. Thus in other words it amounts to nothing more than a grant of temporal authority, confirmatory of that spiritual authority given to bishops by the word of God. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction might in this sense be most truly said to emanate from the king, to be conferred by his bounty, and to be liable to be withdrawn when he pleased; and the king might authorize his bishops to ordain, institute, nominate to benefices, prove wills, grant administration, judge causes, and exercise all other parts of the episcopal jurisdiction, always understanding that this license conferred no proper spiritual power, but one which was in its nature entirely temporal."* This opinion he proceeds to maintain by proofs; but of these more anon.

Mr. Northcote follows up this part of his attack by proceeding to the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and here for the first time appears evidence founded on the words of the bishops themselves: but the inference, attempted to be drawn from the words quoted, is negatived by the words preceding, which shew that Archbishop Parker and the other bishops, in their homage to the Queen,

* Treatise. Part II. cap. iii. viii.

intended it as an abjuration of all foreign power, or authority from any foreign prelate, and as an acknowledgment of the Queen's supremacy; in such wise as that she alone had the power within her own dominions of giving force to that authority derived to all bishops, duly consecrated, from the apostles.

I will now proceed to give some direct testimony concerning the principle held at the Reformation on this point of jurisdiction. One piece of testimony, viz., that from the commissioners in Henry's time, has already been given, and, one would think, were sufficient to shew the real opinions held by the bishops at that time as to the apostolic source of their jurisdiction. There is however testimony of a more direct kind, even their own recorded opinions. It was in 1535 occurred those facts which have been adduced in proof of the admission of a new principle subversive of the notion of an apostolically derived authority. In 1537 appeared the "Institution of a Christian man," which had been composed in convocation three years before. In one of the articles, concerning the authority of bishops and priests, after dividing this authority into two parts, the latter of which is the authority of jurisdiction, the words are thus given by Collier: "The latter touching jurisdiction, committed by God to the hierarchy, they throw into three subdivisions. By the first they are empowered to reprove immorality and misbelief, and excommunicate the obstinate and ungovernable. It is likewise within their commission to moderate their censures and relax in the discipline of the Church. But then by virtue of their character they have no authority upon property or person, or any right to inflict corporeal punishment, and carry their censures to death or imprisonment.

" By the second branch of jurisdiction bishops are authorised by our Saviour to continue the succession and perpetuate the hierarchy. They are the judges of the qualifications for the priesthood, and may admit or refuse as they think fit; and here the rights of patronage, settled by the consultation are allowed, provided there is no just exception against the person presented.

" A third branch of jurisdiction belonging to bishops and priests comprehends the power of making canons for the discipline and service of the Church. And here the book instances in several regulations made by the apostles. It is further observed, that the discipline and ceremonies of the Church were settled by bishops and councils during the first three centuries; and that the consent of the people was likewise concurrent upon such occasions. That after the conversion of kings and princes the bishops had recourse to the assistance of the secular magistrate. This was done to reinforce the jurisdiction of the Church, by the civil sanction; for the Church, as was observed before, has no authority to inflict pecuniary or corporeal punishment. It was upon this view that princes confirmed the ecclesiastical constitutions, and sometimes made regulations in these matters with penalties annexed. They add further that no bishops ought to interpose in civil affairs, upon the strength of their commission, nor pretend to any temporal jurisdiction, independently of princes. And in the close they add, it is part of the regal office to defend the Christian religion, to support the orthodox clergy, to exterminate heresy and idolatry, and to superintend the bishops in the execution of their office."

Collier gives the signatures subscribed to these opinions, and remarks upon them: " The list of the bishops

(i.e. who subscribed) is *complete through both provinces;* but whether that of the lower house (of convocation) was all transcribed by Dr. Ward, may be a question. This book in the sacrament of orders, declares the clergy have their commission from God Almighty, and by consequence that their authority is no grant of the crown, nor the exercise of it dependent on the civil magistrate. Notwithstanding this frank declaration, it passed the test of the court, and was published by the king's printer." Here then is an authoritative exposition of the doctrine of the English Church, put forth even after those facts on which Mr. Northcote so much relies, and of a character wholly contrary to the principle which he asserts was then admitted. In 1543, that is six years later, another book was set forth, viz., the "Necessary Erudition." This has not the authority of the institution, being "drawn up only by a committee of the king's nomination," and not sanctioned by convocation. "This book,"—Collier observes,—"doth not maintain the hierarchical authority so unexceptionably, but gives in to an overbearance of the regale." But this giving in cannot be adduced as a proof of the opinion of the bishops, much less of the English Church; neither indeed is there any countenance in it for Mr. Northcote's charge, for though it allows more to the regale than did the "*Institution,*" yet it nevertheless maintains the divine authority of the priesthood and episcopate, and is opposed to the new principle, which we are told by Mr. Northcote had been admitted. This moreover is made more evident by Cranmer; because he was at that time disposed to admit this new principle, but could not find supporters; and even he returned again to the orthodox opinion to which he had himself previously

subscribed both in the "Declaration" and "Institution." On this again, Collier remarks: "But notwithstanding Cranmer was so unhappy as to change his opinion, as appears by his answer to the questions above mentioned, yet he was overruled by a majority of the bishops, who set forth the 'Erudition of a Christian Man,' and more than that, he seems to have recovered his former sentiments; for he subscribed the 'Erudition,' countenanced it in his diocese, and checked one Joseph, a clergyman, who took the liberty to preach against it." So that his heterodoxy did not last long. And in 1548, he published a catechism, the words of which speak plainly and decisively as to the high and divine authority derived from the Apostles. Further, if Mr. Northcote requires it to be proved that the bishops had no less notion of their divine right and authority in Queen Elizabeth's days, I would refer him to the Queen's message to the House of Commons concerning referring all theological questions to the bishops, and the observations made in consequence in the next session by Mr. Wentworth, who attributed the message to the bishops, relating a conversation he had held with the archbishop, who reprimanded the house for having made themselves judges of such points, saying, "Surely you mistook the matter: you will refer yourselves wholly to us herein." But of a still higher tone is Archbishop Grindal's letter to Queen Elizabeth, wherein he refuses obedience to her commands, and requests her "not to interpose her prerogative in ecclesiastical matters, nor carry the regale thus far into the Church; that she would rather refer points of doctrine and discipline to the management of bishops and divines;" he proceeds to cite the example of Constantine, and the opinions of St. Ambrose, of a

very decided tone, and then adds; "Madam, I wish to God you would steer by this compass. By managing in this manner your Majesty would consult your own repose, please God Almighty better, and avoid many instances of wide conduct; and in short, the government of the Church would go on with a smoother motion, to your Majesty's satisfaction, and the public benefit." He then requests the Queen, if she does interfere in Church matters, "not to pronounce with such absoluteness and resolution as she might do in secular business." The letter proceeds in a very solemn and high tone of fearless warning to the end; inasmuch that even Collier says "it is certain he writes with the spirit of a primitive bishop; his application is religiously brave, and has not the least appearance of interest or fear." The letter "is penned with a mixture of freedom and regard. He writes like a subject in the state, and a governor in the Church; and takes care neither to forget her Majesty, nor himself."* The eleventh chapter of Courayer's Defence will also bear testimony in the same direction as that which I have adduced, and I think that, if the authoritative proofs which I have now brought forward, together with the language of the English Church concerning episcopacy in her various liturgies, be considered, no one will be inclined to say with Mr. Northcote, that at the reformation a new principle was admitted, or a "relinquishment made of all claim to authority as derived from the Apostles, and an acceptance of it at the hands of a power altogether different." Since, in fact, just the very contrary was maintained.

Archbishop Bramhall thus writes.† "Neither do we

* Collier, part ii. Book vi. Vol. vi., 557.

† Just Vindication. Chap. ix.

draw or derive any spiritual jurisdiction from the crown: but either liberty and power to exercise actually and lawfully upon the subjects of the crown that habitual jurisdiction which we received at our ordination; or the enlargement and dilation of our jurisdiction objectively, by the princes referring more causes to the cognizance of the Church than formerly it had; or lastly, the increase of it subjectively, by their giving to ecclesiastical judges an external coercive power which formerly they had not. To go yet one step higher. In cases that are indeed spiritual, or merely ecclesiastical, such as concern the doctrine of faith, or administration of the sacraments, or the ordaining or degrading of ecclesiastical persons, sovereign princes have (and have only) an architectonical power, to see that clergymen do their duty in their proper places. But this power is always most properly exercised by the advice and ministry of ecclesiastical persons; and sometimes necessarily, as in the degradation of one in holy orders by ecclesiastical delegates. Therefore our law provides, that nothing shall be judged heresy with us *de novo*, but by the high court of parliament, wherein our bishops did always bear a part, with the assent (that is more than advice) of the clergy in their convocation. In sum, we hold our benefices from the king, but our offices from Christ. The king doth nominate us, but bishops do ordain us.....The confounding of those two distinct acts, intimated by me in this paragraph, that is nomination or election, with ordination or consecration, hath begotten many mistakes in the world on several sides, among which the respect I owe to the British Churches will not permit me to pass by one untouched." And in another place: "The Kings of England are indeed in our laws called the

Supreme Heads of the Church within their dominions: but how? Not spiritual heads, nor yet ecclesiastical heads; so as S. N. need not fear our deriving our orders from them; but civil heads by an influence of coercive or corroboratory power, by applying or subtracting the matter, by regulating the exercise, by punishing the delinquencies of ecclesiastical judges; that is, as much as to say, as supreme governors, as Saul is called the head of the tribes of Israel, yea of the tribe of Levi amongst the rest."

I trust that enough has been now written to shew that the regal supremacy in the Church of England is very different from what Mr. Northcote would have us believe it to be. Certainly if he chooses to judge solely from Acts of Parliament, or arbitrary proceedings and high sounding words of some of our sovereigns, he may make out a most extraordinary character for an Episcopal Church; but how he can read those witnesses, to which, one would think, he would most naturally turn as the most unexceptionable, I mean the authorised documents of our Church and the recorded opinions of her most prominent divines, and make such an assertion as he has made, does truly seem somewhat marvellous and beyond ordinary understandings. That there is a greater power allowed to the sovereign, as Head of the Church, than he would approve, is not at all impossible; yet it will not one whit the more make that power seem wrong in our eyes because members of the Church of Rome disapprove of it. If it should be thought that this regal supremacy is dangerous, we must remember that it has many safeguards: there is the coronation oath, on which rests the validity of the sovereign's title to the throne; the laws forbid any thing to be " adjudged heresy but

that which heretofore has been so adjudged by the authority of the canonical scriptures, or the first four general councils, or some other general council, wherein the same hath been declared heresy by the express word of scripture; or such as shall be termed heresy by the high Court of Parliament *with the assent of the clergy in convocation.*" Again there are various necessary qualifications for all persons seeking any office in the Christian ministry, and they are bound to take certain oaths, subscribe certain doctrines, undergo examination by the bishop and satisfy him. Therefore here is a safeguard against the convocation becoming heretical. Convocation is a safeguard against any authoritative corruption of the faith; and without the consent of convocation the Crown can decree nothing but what has been decreed. If the Crown should go beyond its prerogative in ecclesiastical matters, the Church is not bound to obedience. If the state were to decree a law subversive of an essential law of the Church, there would be little doubt indeed as to where our submission is due, unless we doubt whether God is higher than man. For the Church is instinct with the Holy Spirit, and speaks to her children with authority. The voice of the Church is the voice of God. Since then the English Church regards her sovereign as her supreme governor, there is no great wonder that her most faithful children should have the most devoted loyalty, because in addition to that obedience to the civil power which the law of God enjoins, and which nothing can justify man in refusing, even to an unbelieving prince, there is added that reverence which the Church enjoins. Of course to a schismatical, or a heretical, or a Pagan monarch, the Church can no longer pay such deference, saving in matters of

a strictly civil nature. The instance however which Mr. Northcote brings forward, the devotion of Archbishop Laud to his king, was one where it could scarcely have been otherwise; the cause of the Church and of the Throne were in his case so identified that the fall or prosperity of the one implied the fall or prosperity of the other.

I have but one or two more passages to notice in this part of the letter now under consideration, before proceeding to shew the extent of power exercised by the sovereign in the ancient and modern Roman Churches. What is the meaning of the following sentence? "When our Lord gave His commission to His Apostles, so far from directing them to the powers of this world for its ratification, He distinctly warned them it must be executed in direct opposition to those, even unto death. And we know from history that it has been so executed; St. Peter and St. Paul sought not at the hands of Nero, the gift of spiritual jurisdiction, before they preached the Gospel in his dominions; St. Athanasius was not slack in the fulfilment of his commission, because of the opposition of princes, &c. &c." This proves nothing against acknowledging the ecclesiastical supremacy of Christian Kings, so long as they attempt nothing subversive of the Church,* and intrude not into ministerial duties; which is all that the Church of England contends for; and which, as I will endeavour to shew presently, has always been admitted by the Church of Christ. Next, I must object to a most unfair misquotation from Hooker, which follows close upon the sentence just referred to. Endeavouring to shew the spirit

* James II. did not find his supremacy acknowledged when he would have transgressed its limits.

of subserviency to the state, which since the reformation is said by Mr. Northcote to have been "one of the most prominent characteristics of our Church," he proceeds: —"Look at the declaration of the judicious Hooker," that "it ought to be the true inscription, style, or title, of all Churches as yet standing within this realm; by the goodness of Almighty God, and His servant Elizabeth, we are." Now this word "ought" does not occur in the passage, as it stands in Hooker; and the words have a very different meaning from that which Mr. Northcote seems desirous of imposing on them. Hooker, praising Queen Elizabeth, and admiring the goodness of God, who had raised her up at that time, and made her an instrument for the preservation of the English Church, says, "that as, 'by the sword of God and of Gideon,' was sometime the cry of the people of Israel, *so it might deservedly be* at this day; ..... the true inscription, style, or title of all Churches, &c." As for the titles of "the bright occidental star" and "the sun in his strength" "sounding to Catholic ears almost blasphemous," I was not aware that Romish ears were so nice upon that point, and certainly one would not suspect it from an examination of Romish breviaries, books of devotions, and books of all kinds. When we find one pope calling the Virgin "a goddess," as did Leo, another, as Gregory XVI., calling her "the only ground of our hope," with many similar phrases; when we find Romish writers calling her the "complement of the Trinity," and affirming that she has power "to command her son;" when we find prayers, published permissu superiorun, such as the following; "O my Lady, Holy Mary, I recommend myself into thy blessed trust, and singular custody and into the bosom of thy mercy, this

night and evermore, and in the hour of death, as also my soul and my body: and I yield unto thee all my hope and consolation, all my distress and miseries, my life and the end thereof, that by thy most holy intercession and by thy merits, all my works may be directed according to thine and thy son's will. Amen." Or another in the Liturgy of our lady, wherein she is styled, "source of the fountain of grace, refuge of sinners, comfort of the afflicted, and advocate of all Christians;" when, I say, we find all these and numberless invocations to other saints (insomuch that Cassander admits that many "put more trust in the merits and intercession of particular saints, than in the merits of Christ,")* it is somewhat a strange sound to our ears to find ourselves accused of blasphemy on such a pretence, by a member of the Church of Rome. Well indeed might the Church of Rome make her index expurgatorius! well might her divines write (as has been written ere now regarding the works of St. Augustine,) *Dele, Solus Deus adorandus,* "expunge, that God alone is to be worshipped."†—I have been led away in these remarks, further from the subject in hand, than I had intended; to return therefore, and consider the authority of the sovereign in the Ancient Church, and the times before the Reformation.

* See all these, and many other similar citations, in Bishop Bull's "Corruptions of the Church of Rome;" also Bishop Taylor's "Dissuasive from Popery."

† Bishop Taylor, in his "Dissuasive," gives many passages which the Church of Rome has erased from the writings of the Fathers, where they have been opposed to Romish teaching; and shews to how great an extent, and by what high authority (even of the Pope himself) this has been practised. See also Dr. Wordsworth's *excellent* Letters to M. Gondon; especially the eleventh; where he shews that the Church of Rome not only fearfully mutilated the works of the Fathers, but even added to them, to countenance her own new and strange doctrines.

The exact extent of this authority in primitive times, seems quite indeterminate, regulated by the inclination of the Emperor to interfere, and of the Bishop to submit. Hence we find some emperors exerting a much greater power, and interfering much more extensively and violently than others, and bishops much more submissive under some circumstances than under others. Undoubtedly strong, bold, and decided speeches of Primitive Bishops are on record, deprecating in plain terms, the interference of the civil power in ecclesiastical affairs.—This much may be admitted, and that without injury to the cause of the Church of England, for were her sovereigns to overstep the bounds of their lawful supremacy to the injury of the church, there is nothing to prevent her raising her voice in remonstrance, and, if her remonstrance were unheeded, resisting even unto death. Nay, to this course she would be bound. Yet if this be needless, she may acquiesce. St. Leo writes to the Emperor Theodosius,* "Besides your care for the empire, you have a most pious care for the Christian religion, that no schisms, or heresies, or offences should gain strength among the people of God, since then is your kingdom best ordered when the strictest reverence is paid to the Eternal Trinity." Here Pope Leo expressly urges it as the duty of the civil power to aid the Church in enforcing her decrees and to maintain the orthodox faith. So St. Augustine exclaims, "What man in his senses would tell kings to be careless in their kingdoms as to who clung to or who opposed the Church of their Lord; and that it does not concern them in their kingdom, who would be religious or impious?" Again he affirms it to be "the part of Christian kings to seek the peace of

* Epist. XXI.

their mother the Church, whence they were spiritually born." And in the passage, whence these words come, he expressly asserts that princes must watch over not secular matters only, but spiritual also. This power they assumed and exercised, often unhappily to the injury of the Church, but often also to her advantage; and then the bishops were so far from objecting to such interference, as being an intrusion into ecclesiastical rights, that they even applauded and sought it. I have not space for any lengthened consideration of instances; they must be sought in the writings of antiquity; or where that is impracticable, abundant instances are given in Palmer's "Treatise" and "Vindication," in Twysden's "Vindication," in Bramhall's and Barrow's works, and indeed in numberless writers both of olden and modern days. I can but touch upon a few of them, and those such as seem to be most remarkable.

In the first place the councils were assembled by the command of the Emperor, as they themselves acknowledge in their synodal epistles, and could not be without it, as is plain from the circumstances preceding the Council of Chalcedon; and they were also confirmed by the Emperor: a confirmation which was sought by the first Council of Constantinople and by that of Ephesus, being earnestly solicited by the fathers, then assembled, in their synodal epistle. In pursuance of these requests the Emperor made laws, forbidding the assembly of the heretics, ordering them to be driven out of their churches, and that the churches should then be restored to the orthodox; so also after the Council of Nicæa Constantine wrote to the various churches throughout the world to enjoin their receiving the decrees; and at the Council of Chalcedon the Emperor

Marcian announced his intention of enforcing the decrees made, under heavy penalties, and of expelling such clergy as refused obedience. Mr. Palmer in his "Vindication" gives several instances of the expulsion of bishops by the imperial power, without ecclesiastical judgment, and this in many cases where the bishop had been in possession some time. One only of these can I refer to, but I will mention this, "because it manifests most distinctly not only the practice of the clergy generally in those ages, but the sentiments even of the bishops of Rome. Timothy Ælurus, having been intruded by the Eutychian party into the See of Alexandria, during the lifetime of the legitimate bishop Timothy Solofaciolus, was expelled by the Emperor Leo, after he had ascertained by enquiries that his ordination was illegitimate. He was restored after some time by the Emperor Basiliscus; and though the Emperor Zeno, on his accession, was desirous of expelling Ælurus again from the See of Alexandria, he was induced for the sake of peace to wait for the death of the intruder, which was speedily expected. When Ælurus died in 478 his party immediately elected and ordained Peter Mongus to the See of Alexandria, although Timothy Solofaciolus the legitimate bishop was still living. When the Emperor was informed of these proceedings, what was his course? did he, or any one else imagine, that a synod was necessary for the deposal of the intruder? The Emperor sent immediate orders to Anthemius, governor of Egypt, to expel Peter, to punish those who had ordained him, and to establish Timothy Solofaciolus in the See of Alexandria, which was accordingly done. The Emperor also commanded all the *bishops*, *clergy*, and laity of Egypt to

return in two months to the communion of Timothy, on pain of being *deprived of their honours and Churches;* and *declared null* all the ordinations of Timothy Ælurus and Peter Mongus. These proceedings were most highly approved by the church generally. The Patriarch of Alexandria sent clergy to Constantinople to thank the Emperor, and Pope Simplicius testified the greatest satisfaction, and applauded the Emperor's conduct." The Codex Theodosianus gives laws concerning holy days, marriages, &c., the faith, the bishops and clergy of the church, heretics, religion, episcopal judgments, &c. The Code of Justinian does the same, even to the most minute regulations concerning divine service in some instances; so also did the Novellæ. "Accordingly in Constit. cxxiii, in forty-three chapters, he did establish many particulars pertaining to the government of the Church and Churchmen; and in Constit. cxxxi., not only appointed the observance of the first four General Councils, but decrees the place or precedency of the Pope of Rome and the Archbishop of Constantinople, should be according to their definitions above all other seats; and how far the diocese of some chairs by him newly erected should extend, besides other points in several chapters to the number of fifteen, treating of particulars, solely held now of ecclesiastical cognizance, as did likewise Charles the Great, and Ludovicus Pius, in their Capitulars, in very many places." These things are mentioned by Twysden,* who names some, "to shew they having been practised by Emperors, the Kings of England endowed from above with the same authority in ecclesiasticis, might very lawfully within their dominions exercise the like." And it must be remembered

* Chap. v., 3.

that the laws and novels of Justinian were not disliked, but held in esteem by the Church. Twysden proceeds in the same chapter to prove from original documents and laws, and the testimony of contemporary history, to how great an extent the regal supremacy was carried in the English Church, in her more ancient days, in the times of Edward the Confessor, and other Monarchs, whom the Church of Rome would hold forth as patterns, but who nevertheless made laws about matters, by conceding which to the crown, Mr. Northcote would fain persuade us that our Reformed Church has lost her apostolicity.

"We often meet with the prince extending his commands to the same thing, the priest did his persuasions; as,—

"I. In point of sacraments, that children should be baptized within thirty days after birth.

"II. And, because it seems some priests were negligent performers of that duty, that such as were not prepared, or denied the baptizing of them, should be punished.

"III. No person be admitted to the eucharist, be a godfather, receive confirmation from a bishop, not knowing the pater noster and belief.

"IV. That persons instructed should receive the communion thrice every year.

"V. Restrained by their laws, matrimony, to the sixth degree of consanguinity.

"VI. Reserved to themselves a liberty of dispensing with the marriage even of nuns. And it is not to be forgot, in that particular, Langfranc joins the king's advice (as a person of equal power) with his own: *et hoc est*, saith he, *consilium regis et nostrum.*

"VII. Commanded the observance of Lent *principali auctoritate.*

"VIII. Appointed certain days to be held festival by the better sort, but allowed the servant and labourer to work in them. I omit here their edicts for the observance of the Lord's day, payment of tithes, incontinency and such like, (held now merely of ecclesiastical cognizance) for the multiplicity of them.

"IX. Divided old, and erected new bishoprics.* Yet this is that Cardinal Bellarmine holds a point of so high concernment, no man can do it without authority obtained from Rome; which yet we never read to have been asked, though Theodore, 679, erected five, *consensu regis*, at one time; and some other altogether without the Pope's liking, as those in the North, after the expulsion of Wilfred.

"X. When the necessities of the Church required, gave bishoprics *in commendam.*

"XI. Caused the clergy of their kingdom to meet in councils, and sometimes presided in them, though the Pope's Legate were present.

"XII. Did by regal authority, as occasion served, appoint the saying masses, and other services in the church."†

I have not space to follow Twysden further in this matter, but I would recommend those, who doubt the extent of the regale in olden times, or wish to see the gradual encroachments of the papacy, to examine his "Vindication of the Church of England" with care. It will go far to remove their doubts. I would only

* Similarly the Emperor Leo Isaurus removed the diocese of Illyricum from under the jurisdiction of Rome, to which it had long been subject, and transferred it to the See of Constantinople, by his own authority.

† Twysden. Chap. v. 6.

once more remind the objectors to our regal supremacy, that the sovereign is bound by the laws and canons of the Church, and can exact no obedience beyond, or against these: he is head only "so far as the law of Christ allows;" we give our princes "that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture."* If the sovereign attempt to go beyond this, the Church is freed from her obedience; "insomuch as we may safely conclude, when the clergy in convocation styled Henry VIII. *ecclesiæ Anglicanæ protectorem unicum et supremum dominum, et quantum per Christi legem licet, supremum caput*, they added nothing new unto him, but a past title; for he and his successors after it, did never exercise any authority in causes ecclesiastic, not warranted by the practice of former kings of this nation."†

There yet remains to consider, the extent of the regal supremacy in the Churches of Roman obedience, since the Reformation; I say since the Reformation, because to take in the times preceding that era, would require a large volume filled with regal and civil interference in ecclesiastical affairs. Even in those, to which the enquiry is confined, only two or three of the more particular and extraordinary cases can be mentioned; for other matters, I would simply refer to Mr. Palmer's Treatise, more especially under his article on Jansenism. There will be discovered a long list of irregularities, violations of discipline, interference with doctrine, suppression of monasteries, regulations even of the minutiæ of divine service, divisions and suppressions of bishoprics, edicts and changes in matters of faith, even in points decided by the Council of Trent, suspension

* Article xxxvii. † Twysden. v., 24.

of the bishops from the powers of conferring orders, in a word, every conceivable suspension and violation of discipline, and of interference in matters purely ecclesiastical, emanating from, and enforced by, the civil power,* notwithstanding all the remonstrances of the Popes, submitted to moreover by many of the bishops, nay, in many cases encouraged by them; whilst those opposed to such proceedings, were nevertheless compelled by imperial edicts and parliamentary decrees, to receive into communion those whom they deemed heretical, and had even excommunicated. Nor did this happen only in one or two places, but in the very strongholds of the Romish faith, in Portugal,† Italy, Germany, France; in a greater degree doubtless in some of these countries than in others; yet nevertheless in some degree in all; insomuch that no proceeding of our sovereigns however arbitrary, but has its parallel, not to say its excess, in the deeds of the sovereigns of Romish countries. To take first of all the Gallican Church. Passing by the early part of the Jansenist disputes, we find in the middle of the eighteenth century, the French Parliament forcing the orthodox clergy to administer the Sacrament to the Jansenists, and if they refused, punishing with imprisonment or exile; insomuch that bishops and archbishops who refused compliance, were driven into banishment. In 1790, the national convention put forth the "Civil constitution of the clergy," thereby changing the whole system of Church government, forbidding appeals, altering and suppressing dioceses,

* Dr. Wordsworth also shews in a brief note to his xii. letter, how Romish sovereigns have even suppressed whole services at pleasure, and mutilated the breviary.

† See Pereira's Tentativa Theologica, and the events which preceded and followed that work.

limiting the jurisdiction of the bishops, decreasing their number by suppression of the old dioceses, and erecting in their stead, rather more than half the number of new ones, driving out all the bishops (the great majority) who refused to accept the constitution, and appointing others in their stead; in a word, so acting, that the Gallican Church became made up of schismatics, intruders, and heretics, as one of their own bishops prove. In 1801, took place the Concordat between Buonaparte and the Pope, by which several of these schismatical intruders were appointed to sees, the rightful bishops whom they had dispossessed being still alive; their protest was disregarded, and the Pope suppressed upwards of a hundred-and-fifty bishoprics at once, creating only sixty in their place; all the irregularities which had taken place were overlooked, or sanctioned by the Pope, and the Church was made entirely dependent and subservient to the government; the abolition of the convents was confirmed; and all these things having been granted, the government proclaimed that the Catholic Church should be the national Church of France, supported and paid by the state, and exercising its worship publicly and freely, subject however even in this, to such regulations as the government might deem necessary. To the concordat, a decree of regulations concerning discipline was added prohibiting the procuring of briefs, &c. from Rome, or holding a council without the civil sanction, enjoining appeals of discipline to be brought to the council, regulating the age of admission to the priesthood, requiring the subscription of professors to the articles of 1682, and what was thought worst of all as being in direct opposition to the decrees of Trent, ordering that on the death of the bishop, instead of

vicars elected by the chapters as that council enjoined, the grand vicars of the respective dioceses should administer the affairs and use the episcopal authority until the appointment of a new prelate; the bishops might not even confer orders without the consent of the government; the exiled prelates remonstrated in vain; the Pope, unwillingly and reluctantly indeed, agreed to the concordat, and then remonstrated against the additional regulations as fruitlessly as the prelates had remonstrated against his own proceedings. It is scarcely possible to conceive a Church more subjected to the civil power, more abridged in its jurisdiction, more interfered with in her discipline, and even in points of faith, than was the Gallican; yet will Mr. Northcote be willing to admit that that Church has forfeited her apostolicity? It was in truth but a carrying to excess the right which had been exercised by Charlemagne and St. Louis, by Charles VII. and Charles IX., both of whom with their parliaments confirmed or set forth anew, various regulations concerning matters, which Romanists would fain have us believe, appertain by right to ecclesiastical cognizance. I have in the former part of these pages referred to the proceedings of the Reforming party, and the Emperor, Joseph II., in the Church of Germany, but I must now allude to them again; and will extract from Mr. Palmer's Treatise, several quotations from a Romish historian. By Joseph, "the religious orders were forbidden to obey foreign superiors; many convents were suppressed; they were prohibited from receiving novices. The Protestants were favoured; the clergy required to give an account of their revenues. It was no longer permitted to have recourse to Rome for dispensations of marriage. The

imperial *placet* was prescribed for all bulls, briefs, or rescripts from Rome. The bishops were forbidden to confer orders for some time. In fine, there was an uninterrupted series of regulations which changed all usages, and subverted discipline. The attention of the reformer extended to the most minute objects; he suppressed confraternities, abolished processions, retrenched holy days, prescribed the order of the offices, regulated ceremonies, the number of masses, the manner of saying the *saluts*, even the quantity of wax lights to be used in the service. The Emperor left the bishops nothing more to do, seized their revenues, excluded them from the states of their province, and destroyed their sees. Some professors were accused of heresy; Joseph declared them absolved, deprived their accuser of his place of Archdeacon of Olmutz, blamed strongly those ecclesiastics who had dared to sustain the constitution Unigenitus, (a Papal Bull) interdicted the pulpit for ever, and in all places to those who had spoken against the accused, declared that the bull *Unigenitus*, and *In Cœnâ Domini*, having never yet been, nor hereafter to be received, should be removed from all the liturgical books where they were found; ordered an absolute silence on the constitution Unigenitus, (notwithstanding several prelates and the papal nuncio remonstrated, affirming it to be a judgment of the Universal Church,) commanded images to be removed from Churches; suppressed some impediments to marriage, established others, and permitted divorce in certain cases. The Archbishop of Goritz having opposed these innovations, the Emperor suppressed his see, commanded him to send in his resignation, and on his refusal, ordered him to set off for Rome. He was at last compelled to take an oath of

obedience to the Emperor's orders; to confess that he had grossly disobeyed those orders, and to throw himself on his clemency. In fine, he was ordered to go to his diocese, and put the royal edicts in execution." Four archbishops proceeded to maintain doctrines accounted heretical by Rome; took away the papal power; declared if the Pope "refused to confirm the bishops, they would find in the ancient discipline means to preserve their office, under the protection of the Emperor." These and other such like proceedings took place in Germany, and of this Church Mr. Northcote might well say that, which he charges upon the Church of England. The Pope remonstrated, several bishops protested; yet the Emperor paid no regard, the other bishops were submissive and often willing, the refractory were obliged to yield; yet nevertheless, the Pope ventured on no excommunication, the Catholic Church never accounted the Austrian or German Church as bereft of its apostolicity; it continues to this present time to exercise no slight influence over the proceedings of the Pope. Did our sovereigns ever behave thus? Were our bishops ever thus compelled to submit to proceedings, which they deemed and pronounced heretical and contrary to the essential laws of their Church? Why then are they pronounced to have yielded up their claims to apostolicity, whilst the German Church is allowed to retain hers? Neither has the state in Austria since yielded up its power in Church matters; the decree against the constitution Unigenitus, is still in force; appeals can be made from the ecclesiastical to the civil power; excommunications are first discussed by lay and ecclesiastical commissioners, and cannot be pronounced without the Emperor's consent. This is carried still further in Sicily, where the

King in the "Tribunal of the monarchy," excommunicates, and decides finally in ecclesiastical causes. If we turn our attention to Spain, the same principle appears. It was by a commission from the King that the Inquisitors were empowered to purge all Catholic authors, and make their expurgatory index; it was by ordinance of the crown that the Council of Trent was received by that Church, for the King, in 1564, issued an edict, "commanding the cardinals and others of his clergy to observe it, without making any mention of the Pope." It was from the sovereigns of Spain that the Inquisition had received its powers; by them they had been increased; by the pragmatic sanction of Charles III. in 1767, these powers were much restricted; and by the same act the Jesuits were annihilated, banished from Spain, and their property confiscated. We will proceed and pass by the acts of Philip II. in 1556, and Philip V. in 1709, who cut off intercourse with Rome by reason of some disputes. In 1813 a new constitution was adopted, and at the same time, the Inquisition was abolished, the monastic orders were suppressed, their property seized, and many reforms were made in matters ecclesiastical. After Ferdinand's restoration he deprived the Archbishop of Toledo of his See, appointing in his stead a violent opponent of the new constitution, and reversing all which had been done in the previous year. Some six years afterwards he was compelled to retrace his steps, and re-enforce the decrees of 1813. I know not exactly what may be the present state of relations between Rome and the Spanish Church; but no long time since the Pope refused to confirm the bishops appointed by the regent, so much that most of the sees were occupied by bishops solely appointed by the

government. The tithes were taken from the clergy; the cathedral estates were seized and sold to defray the national debt; the monastic orders suppressed, and their property sold; and the nunneries had only left them a limited existence up to the death of those by whom they were then occupied. I will transcribe the words of a note in the Archbishop of Upsal's "Review." "The bill which on the 20th of Jan. 1842, was brought in to the Cortes, abolishes the supremacy of Rome, prohibits communication between the clergy and the Pope, places the right of dispensation within the kingdom, enjoins that all brevets, rescripts, and bulls, shall not be kept more than twenty-four hours before they are delivered to the government; that no money shall be sent to Rome for spiritual purposes, &c. The Pope, after having by allocutions of 1st Feb. 1836, and 1st March, 1841, expressed himself dissatisfied with the Spanish government, became now exceeding exasperated at this bill, so that he, by a brevet to the whole of Roman Catholic Christendom, of the 24th Feb. 1842, pronounced his condemnation of Spain, entreating all good christians to pray for this lost child." Nor are matters yet finally and satisfactorily arranged between Rome and Spain, notwithstanding a concordat which I believe (I do not speak with certainty) was entered into, and which now is Rome's expedient for keeping up a show of authority. Here again are instances of violent interference with the Church on the part of the State, and for the forced submission of the clergy to acts which themselves denounce. It may be said that these are not instances sufficient to prove fully the acceptance by that Church of a new principle, such as Mr. Northcote charges upon the reformed Church of England; but they were not

intended to prove this, but simply to shew that even in that most bigoted of Romish lands the state has violently exercised its authority in matters ecclesiastical even to the enforcement of the decrees of councils, the deprivation of bishops, and the interruption of communion with Rome; and that many of those acts which are most loudly clamoured against in our reformed sovereigns, have their parallel in the Church of Spain: yes, and in all the Churches of the Roman obedience; whilst in some they have been exceeded in no slight degree. If those things which were done at our Reformation are to prove our abandonment of the principle of apostolical succession and jurisdiction, despite of the authoritative assertions of our Church to the contrary; then do I maintain that the deeds enacted in the unreformed Churches, will prove the same in their cases; and we must admit that apostolicity has ceased in the Church of Christ. This cannot be; nor can I see any reason for asserting that it is so: all these Churches have formally taught the orthodox and primitive doctrine on this point, our own amongst the rest; all have preserved their succession by apostolical ordination; all have, some in a greater, some in a less degree, admitted the regal supremacy; and all have been compelled to submit to arbitrary excesses and violent exercises of that same supremacy. Mr. Northcote has trodden on tender ground; let him beware that, in endeavouring to undermine the Church of England, he does not undermine the Church Catholic. I do not pretend to defend these excesses; I am willing to denounce them; I offer no opinion on the legitimate extent of the regal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters; I simply assert that the Kings of England have never exerted, and the Church of

England never submitted to a greater stretch of this authority, than did the Church Catholic before the reformation, and than have the Romish Churches since that time. I might have traced out this submission of the church to the crown more fully, and have referred for proofs to more churches; but this, as it is unnecessary to my purpose, so would it extend far beyond my intended limits,—indeed the instance of one church, acknowledged by Romanists as Catholic, is sufficient to defend our own. We need nothing more for such defence than the proceedings in the Church of Germany, or of France; let alone all the rest.

It now only remains to comment on a few of the remaining assertions in Mr. Northcote's letters. He endeavours to prove that the English Church did not receive the Reformation, and carries his appeal to Queen Elizabeth's days. But the question rests in this matter, not on those days, but the times of Henry and Edward. It was in the days of those sovereigns that the English Church received, and formally sanctioned the Reformation. I have before mentioned the testimony of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, regarding the unanimity of rejecting the Papal rule throughout all classes; and it will be a very difficult matter for Mr. Northcote to shew that before the reign of Queen Mary the Reformation was not received by the whole English Church. It had in truth her formal sanction, a sanction never synodically repealed, but only suspended by royal authority in Mary's reign, and therefore rightly enforced by Queen Elizabeth; whose method of treating the refractory bishops, I have already justified. So that to Mr. Northcote's assertion—that in her reign, when the oath of supremacy was tendered, "every single bishop

excepting one only, refused to take it,"—it is sufficient to answer, 1—that they were bound by the laws of their church to take it, and therefore on refusal, were justly expelled. 2—That they were all either intruders or uncanonically appointed to their sees, and therefore could have no right to decide any question of the English Church. They were intruders and schismatics before they refused the oath. As for the stringent measures adopted for crushing the so-called "Catholic spirit," we would remind Mr. Northcote of the measures which the preceding reign had adopted to correct the reforming spirit; and in the next place it must be remembered that the Romanists in Queen Elizabeth's time were not mere schismatics, but rebels plotting against their sovereign, and disavowing her authority, men whose own proceedings precluded the possibility of toleration. These rigours were essential as political safeguards,* not merely as ecclesiastical punishments.

* Nor has the Church of Rome altered; at present she has not the power to persecute, and pretends that if she possessed the power it would not be used; she pretends to be loyal and not oppose the rights of sovereigns. Such is the language of her adherents, and unfortunately too many believe her. Hence in these liberal tolerating careless days, men cannot see why Romanists should be more restricted in civil privileges, and in the exercise of their faith, than other sects. We are told that the days for rebellion, for the subjection of the Crown to the Pope, for persecution, and such like, are gone by; and so indeed they are, so long as the Church of Rome is in weakness. But let her regain strength, let her proselytise and gain the mastery, and her ancient spirit will re-appear; she will seek her old dominion, both over Church and State. She *must* do so. It is a part of her faith. Her power over sovereigns is strongly asserted in councils, to which she is bound to submit, and in her canon law; persecution is a part of her bishops' oaths. She cannot on her fundamental principles endure mere toleration, she is bound to seek for mastery. It is not with her as with other sects; they profess to tolerate in return: she is bound to do more; she must proselytise. No Romanist, really faithful to his Church, can be faithful to his sovereign, so long as that sovereign is not of his creed; no Romanist faithful to his Church can quietly allow any sovereign to be supreme in his own dominions. The Papacy is subtle and restless; Romanists are bound to overthrow our faith, and to convert or dethrone our sovereigns if they can but gain power; (see Concil. 4, Lateran. Can. 3, de Hæret: also Jesuit's Oath of Secresy,)

It may be all very well to endeavour to transform into martyrs and confessors for their faith, a number of people who suffered and were exiled for their treasons and conspiracies. But they had caused that even the exercise of their faith could not be dissociated from treason. When however Mr. Northcote writes thus, "an act had been passed, that if any one should say, or hear mass, he should for the first offence, forfeit all his goods; for the second, suffer banishment; and for the third, death;"—he has surely been led into a strange and ludicrous error. I can find no such act passed by the English Parliament; but these are the very provisions of an act passed by the Scotch Convention in 1560, so that it after all concerns not the English Church at all, and is about as extraordinary a mistake as could well have been committed. Neither is it true as Mr. Northcote asserts, that "in 1560, (ten years before the bull in question was issued,) a penalty of £20 a month was already exacted from all who were not present at worship, after the established form." This penalty was not imposed until the year 1581, the twenty-third of Elizabeth's reign, eleven years *after* the bull of Pope Pius, and when the Papists had given constant proofs of their rebellious spirit and treasonable designs. In fact it was one of the provisions of a bill expressly brought in "for retaining the Queen's subjects in their due obedience." By this same bill also it was enacted, "that every person convicted of saying mass shall forfeit

they have no choice, unless they choose to neglect the decrees of councils which they are bound to obey; and what then becomes of their allegiance to their Church? I would recommend to our modern endowers of Maynooth, our advocates for relief of Romish disabilities, &c., the perusal of Dr. Wordsworth's Letters on the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome. We require more restrictions for our own defence against her increasing aggressions, not the loss of those few which we do possess.

two hundred marks, and a year's imprisonment; and those who willingly hear mass, were liable to the forfeiture of a hundred marks, and one year's imprisonment." Thus this "stringent system" was not adopted until twenty-one years later than Mr. Northcote places it, and then as a political measure, differing in many respects from what Mr. Northcote represents. The penalty for absence from public worship, previous to this time, had been not £20, but twelve pence.* Surely these are unpardonable mistakes in writing on so vital a question as Mr. Northcote has treated of in his letters; and yet how grievous, and how frequent have these mistakes been.

Again, as an argument to us, the parallel between our Church and any Arian community, is simply absurd; we claim to be not in heresy, but orthodox, and the contrary must first be proved; hence we assert that Romish Bishops are needless intruders into a church, which has canonically reformed herself and restored a corrupted faith nearer to primitive purity. The question between us is doubtless very deep, even that of the supremacy, but until that point is proved against us, we rightly "deny the Apostolicity of the Roman Church in this kingdom, simply on the ground of intrusion." Of course we grant that "it is mere unreality to talk of the English and Roman Churches as rival communions with no important point at issue between them, but that of rightful jurisdiction in this country," for we accuse the Church of Rome of grievously corrupting the faith; at the same time we deny that "if the Roman be a true Church anywhere, she is the only true church here; for such she is (says Mr. Northcote) according to her

* 1 Eliz., c. 2.

own theory, and if that theory is false, she is a false church everywhere. The two churches are antagonist bodies, representing antagonist principles, and holding antagonist systems of faith; and therefore laying aside all questions of succession or jurisdiction, they cannot, here or anywhere, be both Apostolical!" A staggering conclusion, could it only be proved; but it is much more easy to assert this than to establish its truth. We contend, and we believe, truly, that Rome holds with ourselves all the fundamental essential points in christian faith,* but so overlaid with corruptions and additions, that often the original principle seems almost destroyed; it is no proof that she is a false church, because she has added a false theory to the truth, and chooses pertinaciously to maintain it. A sickly, corrupted, and deformed limb, is still a member of the same body as a sound one, although so defaced from its former beauty, that the original form is scarce discernable, by reason of the numberless disfigurements.

Next, we are pressed with an argument more specious than real, but nevertheless by no means new, viz., that the bishops before and after the reformation could not both be Apostolical, because they preached different doctrines, which could not both be Apostolical. But this argument is based on the same old and oft-recurring fallacy, that the reformation destroyed the old religion and brought in a new one; whereas it only destroyed the excrescences and corruptions of Romanism, and thereby left that old Catholic truth exposed more clearly to view,

* Bishop Cosin's list of differences and agreements between us and the Church of Rome, is a conclusive answer to Mr. Northcote's assertion on this point; he shews plainly that the foundations of the faith are the same in each, although Rome has built up numerous corrupt and unauthorized doctrines. Mr. Palmer gives the witness of eminent Romanists to the non-existence of *essential* differences. (Treatise i., x., iv.)

which before was almost hidden: we maintain that in essential points of faith, we agree with the other Apostolical Churches of the world; that by these, all the churches continue Apostolic as well as ourselves, although maintaining other false additions which we repudiate. Doubtless we acknowledge with Mr. Northcote, that a church needs to be one, holy, Catholic, and possessed of an apostolic episcopate to be herself apostolic; and all this we both claim to ourselves, and in its degree allow it to others. The remaining part of this letter concerning the Christian kingdom, I need not discuss again; but I must deny the fairness of the following assertion, that "the Anglican theory would have it, the church in each nation has really no necessary dependence on the church in any other nation, but is a part and parcel of the constitution of the realm, and hangs on the throne as its supreme authority." This is not, and never was the Anglican theory. The Church of England acknowledges no such independent existence of individual churches; no such inseparable independence on the state as this.* The monarch is bound by the laws of the Kingdom of Heaven, laws of which no earthly enactments can do away the obligation; if this be attempted, the church takes up of necessity a separate existence; for it is only while the state is guided by the divine laws of the church that these earthly and spiritual kingdoms are or can be united. The laws of earth may change, the laws of heaven cannot; but by the latter must the former be moulded, these fundamental heavenly laws being one and the same for ever throughout the whole Christian Kingdom.

* Scotland is a proof; the English Church does not acknowledge Presbyterianism, although the state form of religion, but only recognises the Episcopal Church.

As regards the contents of the concluding letter, I have but little to say, fully agreeing with Mr. Northcote in the principle which he lays down that we must be first satisfied of the credentials of our church to teach, and not decide the question between us and Rome by examining the doctrines beforehand. I need not follow him through his discussion concerning the invocation of Saints, &c.*—This belongs to an entirely different branch of the controversy; is a departure from the broad general testing principle proposed by the Nicene Creed, and a descending to detail, which is endless and belongs to the original purpose neither of Mr. Northcote nor myself. Undoubtedly I give my full assent to all the general principles laid down in his tenth letter, and therefore need not examine them; on two or three points only do I wish to make any observations. One cannot but feel surprised at the manner in which he complains that we will not receive Romanists' own explanations of their doctrines, after his own rejection of the explanations offered by the whole course of our greatest divines on the teaching of our church, in the case of the Christian Sacrifice, the Real Presence, and Holy Orders. Moreover he forgets what very forced explanations we are wanted to receive; he himself would fain persuade us that his church in no other way prays to the saints, than as we ask each others' prayers on earth. "*Ora pro Nobis*" he affirms to be the whole extent of their worship; and says, that with them this doctrine "has its proper place, and finds all the corrective which it needs in other doctrines and practices no less stringently enforced." Of the truth of this I

* Other Romish doctrines militate quite as much against natural conscience, e. g. Image Worship.

will leave others to judge who will examine some of the Romish Services, and some books published *permissu superiorum;* I cannot but think that some few instances, which have been given in these pages, are difficult to reconcile with this assertion. What the words of St. Augustine are intended to prove, (quoted in page 134) it is difficult to conceive, unless to weaken all that he has previously written. Again, he objects to the phrase "church of our baptism" as meaningless. Of course no one denies that the baptized are baptized into the whole church; that baptism is not local and national. But we do maintain that the branch of the church wherein we gained our baptism, has a peculiar claim to our allegiance, so that if she be engaged in a dispute with any other branch to the interruption of communion, we must side with her against her enemy; we may not choose our position and withdraw from her's to a strange communion, except upon conviction on other grounds, that she has wholly ceased to be a part of the church, and in a disputed point we may think our own church wrong and her opponent right, without thinking it sufficient ground for excommunication. If the whole Catholic Church is our mother, each man's own church is doubly a mother to him. The defence of the rebaptization of converts cannot be grounded on its being *conditional* by the principles of the Roman Church, because by the Catechism of Trent, this conditional baptism is forbidden, unless the case of the person to be thus baptized has been thoroughly enquired into; now this is not the case with all these new converts. "The conditional form of baptism is by the authority of Pope Alexander permitted only for those, about whose right reception of baptism, a doubt remains *after careful enquiry; other-*

wise it is never allowable to thus administer it."* Lastly, it only remains to again deny that the question at issue is, "which is the true Church?" or, "to which do the notes of the Creed belong?" The real question is, "are they not both parts of the true church, both parts of that Catholic Church to which the notes of the Creed belong?"

I have thus followed Mr. Northcote through his letters step by step; imperfectly I am aware, but I trust not without some success. It has been painful as shewing how slight are the grounds on which those who were once on our side, have ranged themselves against us, and how weak and false and perverted are the arguments by which they endeavour to justify themselves, and overthrow the church, by whose aid they were first taught to know "the Lord that bought" them; yet at the same time joyful, because adding an additional proof to the numbers before given, that on all sides is the Church of England defended against her detractors, and that the shafts sped by her enemies against her, do but recoil upon themselves. The Apostolicity of the Church of Rome, I do not deny, and neither can it be denied to the Church of England. Both are parts of the Church Catholic, and therefore both claim Catholicity. That both can produce high examples of sanctity, is undeniable. Whilst both belonging to the one Catholic Church, both possess thereby the note of unity. Yet try the churches each by this test, and we maintain that our Apostolicity is higher than that of Rome; our succession is as indisputable as hers, whilst we abide far more closely "in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship" than she does; we maintain that our Catholicity is

* Cat. Trid., Pars. ii., Cap. ii., Quæstio 56.

greater and more unquestionable than hers for this same reason; that our doctrine is that which the church has held everywhere from the beginning, Catholic in time and place, whilst hers is but of a new and doubtful birth; we maintain that our individual sanctity is equal to her own, whilst in aggregate holiness and holy teaching, we far surpass her; we maintain that,—for internal unity,—she has been more distracted by heresies within, than even ourselves: in a word, on no point do we admit her superiority, but rather challenge it to ourselves. Has then the church failed? Assuredly not: in imperfection and weakness she certainly is, but she will remain for ever, tried and assaulted from within and from without, yet supported through all her dangers, and crowned at length with glory; militant indeed now for a season, but triumphant hereafter for ever. Nor do we gain our least important support from Romish writers; some as Courayer, and Bossuet, maintain and acknowledge the validity of our orders; others, as Milner and Du Pin, assert our orthodoxy on particular points,—until almost all are defended. Others, quarrelling amongst themselves, lay down principles in their own defence, which prove to be equally efficacious to the English Church, such to wit, as the arguments by which the Gallican writers combat Ultramontane.* Are we accused of our dependence on the state, and our submission to the regal supremacy, Pereira, De Marca, Stapleton, and numberless other Romish writers will prove for us all which is needful to our position; even are we accused of the divisions within our church, and the open defiance

* Pereira's admirable work came into my hands too late for me to take much notice of it; it is quite as good a defence of the English, as of the Portugese Church, by the principles there laid down and proved.

of her authority; we answer in the words of the Romanist Bailly, that "the church tolerates heretics within her bosom, and does not formally keep them from communion, though not accounting them as sons. She sometimes tolerates those who oppose her settled decrees from motives of prudence, to avoid a worse calamity; or with the hope that they may be restored to better things." In a word, from the writings and admissions of our adversaries we may gather all which is needful to our defence. Again, it is no slight presumption in our favour, when we find our enemies shifting so constantly their ground of attack, raising up new accusations from time to time, which would never have been heard of had it not been that former ones had failed; nay, bringing forward pure groundless inventions of the most shameless kind, for instance, such as the Nag's Head fable; inventions which in the end, being discovered, strengthen our cause to the weakening of that of our opponents. May we not look, rather can we help looking, with distrust upon a church whose advocates are thus indirectly our best defence, or calculated to bring shame upon their own cause; whose defenders are compelled to abandon the old ground taken up in former times by their most eminent predecessors, yea declared to be a principal foundation by the authoritative voice of their church herself, yielding up the long contested point of the sufficiency of tradition, and taking refuge in defiance of the Council of Trent in a theory of development. Must we not distrust a church which calls the aid of persecution to her support, and leans upon the assistance of a secret society, like the Jesuits, bound by its oath and constitutions to the assuming any heresy, the maintenance and commission of any lie, and the

performance of even mortal sin, should the church be in need, and the command thereunto be given.* Must we not distrust a church which from early times has had recourse to deceit and fraud; as when Pope Zosimus would fain have pawned upon the African Church the pretended canons of Nicæa, or as in the pretended donations of Constantine, or the forged decretals so favourable to papal usurpation, or the additions and interpolations made in the fathers to bring teaching into conformity with Rome, or the index expurgatorius by which the Catholic writers of the Primitive Church were to be purified of all teaching, and all expressions unfavourable to her new doctrines; a system sanctioned and pursued by a Pope. Ought not these things to make us look upon that church with suspicion and distrust, and be cautious indeed how we admit the evidence advanced by those who uphold her? Surely when we consider all these things, we cannot but regard with suspicion (when church matters are involved) even those whom at other times we should most esteem and trust. Far be it from us to accuse all her members of this dishonesty and deceit; her communion doubtless numbers many who would be too noble-minded to stoop to such contrivances, and who would reject with scorn the bare supposition of lending themselves to such a system. Yet how are we to distinguish the trustworthy from the deceitful? this is beyond our power, and therefore we can trust none; nor has Rome any right to complain of this; it is the fault of herself and of those principles which she has permitted to become so rife within her. And yet, alas, she has allured some of those who might

* See this proved in Dr. Wordsworth's second Letter on the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome, page 56 to the end; also the conclusion of Letter viii.

have been shining lights in our church, into the meshes of her fatal net, blinded to the corruptions and uncatholicity of her doctrines, insensible to the insurmountable difficulties which stand in the way of her overweening claims. Still moreover is she urging on her course, and putting forth all her strength to reduce this land once more to her obedience. It is no slight and contemptible foe with whom we have to deal; craftily and wilily does she approach; her efforts are incessant; her mode of attack is wary, insinuating, secret, and too often unscrupulous. The danger to our church and to our faith must not be underrated nor despised; but on all sides does it behove us to be on our guard, that we may not ourselves be taken unawares, and so far as possible may not allow others to be so, confident ourselves, as we may most justly be, and striving to increase and confirm the confidence of others, in our own most Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Not indeed needlessly reviling or insulting, nor speaking with unnecessary harshness of a fallen and corrupted, but nevertheless still a sister church; yet not regarding with too indifferent an eye her failings and her errors, not palliating her sins, not underrating her grievous and manifold defects and pollutions, not looking upon her with a fondness inconsistent with the love and allegiance due to our own church, not indulging the sickly cravings of a diseased fancy for things unessential, and too often corrupt, which our own church grants not to her members, nay in many cases forbids. There is a line drawn between us and Rome, the which if we pass, we forsake the guide of our footsteps and must wander by ourselves unaided, until we probably fall into the arms of a new and strange guide, as the necessary consequence of our pride and

wilfulness. With Rome, as she is, we could not fully communicate; some change must come over her, ere with her our church could be fully one. Her image-worship and invocations to the saints would preclude the possibility of our fully joining in her worship; her half communion would leave us doubtful and dissatisfied; these are practical points, which even were mere dogmatical differences left open between us, would render our communion with her, to say the least of it, cold, unsatisfactory, and constrained. Yet there have been found men in the communion of the English Church claiming to hold all Roman doctrine, and even still we may fear that some look with too kindly and longing an eye upon that church and her uncatholic teaching. There seems unhappily to be danger, not only from without, but also from within; a danger to undisciplined and ardent minds, unable to rest within due bounds, from want of sufficient learning, or sufficient patience to correct their excesses. But if there be danger from the side of Rome, infinitely greater is the danger on the side of Puritanism. Many deny this and appeal in proof to the numerous and lamentable secessions to the idolatries of Rome; but they forget that we do not know of those who depart in the other direction—they do not make formal recantations of their Creed, they quietly cross over from the church to the conventicle, and it is unknown beyond their own parish.—There is no "receiving," nothing to mark what they have done; and unhappily the liberal indifferent careless spirit which marks our age, thinks little of such doings, and they are passed over unnoticed.—But further, these persons do not see the necessity of making a formal departure, permitting themselves an unlimited

license of private judgment, they remain where they are, or go forth, as if it were a thing indifferent; so that where there is one member of our church who oversteps Anglican teaching towards Rome, there are hundreds who come short, lingering on the side of protestant dissent. What clergyman would have dared with impunity to ally himself with Romanists, and join with them publicly in the solemn offices of his church, as we have unhappily seen of late, clergymen joining in the vagaries and heresies of the Evangelical alliance; allying themselves with heretics and schismatics, whose dearest wish would be to overthrow that church against which they are in rebellion. Alas some few, happily very few of our rulers in mistaken zeal have set them an example in their lamentable association with the protestantism of Germany, by uniting with Prussia in appointing a bishop to a foreign see. When such an example is set, we can scarcely wonder if others follow it out to an extreme excess, others—I say—who professedly members of the English Church, and presuming even to officiate at her altars, dare to explain away or to deny her doctrines, almost without reproof. These are the men, who claim to themselves the utmost limit of private judgment, yet are the first to deny it to others, whose opinions differ from their own. By their rule, private judgment may be exercised, but in that one direction to which their own wayward folly may lead them. Professing a hatred of the Pope and his assumed authority, they would each fain constitute a papacy in themselves; loudly denying the infallibility of the Pope or of the church, yet they claim each one to himself to be infallible, and in their presumption, brand as heretics, those who dare to differ from themselves,—albeit those, thus

branded, seek no more than to maintain the manifest doctrines of their church. Crying out loudly againt men who venture to suggest a non-natural sense to the articles of the church, they are the first to impose a non-natural, or as they call it, an "hypothetical" construction on her most solemn services, her holiest rites, and her most plain and undeniable teaching. The authors of "Bracketed Prayer Books" and "hypothetical" dishonesty, are the first to clamour against those who venture on any similar course in a contrary direction. I mean not to uphold either party, I would, that neither holders of all Roman doctrine, nor maintainers of all Protestant heresy should be within the pale of the English Church; but surely it is a hard thing that if the one are suffered to indulge their eccentricities as they please, they should deny to the others a like license, and cry out against their want of principle, and denounce them as dishonest. It is surely a strange thing; men who deny the Apostolical succession seek their orders at the hand of a bishop, continuing within a church which declares in her services that episcopacy is a divine appointment; men who deny sacramental grace continue members of a church which declares the sacraments to be "*effectual* signs of grace;" deniers of baptismal regeneration, read our baptismal service, and swear to maintain the teaching of the Prayer Book; those, who would degrade the Holy Eucharist to a mere sign, subscribe to our XXVIII. Article, read the exhortation, and offer up the prayer of consecration, &c. in the communion service; those, who deny the power of absolution to the priest, endure to hear the commission and powers given to them at their ordination, and venture to remain ministers of a church which requires them to use this power and to declare

with their own mouths, that "Our Lord Jesus Christ hath left power to his Church to absolve," and that "by his authority committed *to them, they* absolve, &c;" those who declaim against primitive teaching, and deny the writings of the Fathers of the church, remain teachers in a church which requires from them the study and the knowledge of these writings, forbidding to explain Holy Scripture in any other sense than those same Holy Fathers, and the first four General Councils have explained it, asserting that it was on their teaching that she founded her own; men who deny the power of the church to dogmatise, continue in one which has claimed and exercised that right, and requires her children to accept her creeds; men who pray against "false doctrine, heresy, and schism," are found uniting themselves with schismatics and heretics of every denomination. These things are very strange and incomprehensible, but it is stranger and more inexplicable still to find these very men raising an outcry against others who claim to themselves a similar right, and accusing others of dishonesty, who act upon the same principle as themselves. But above all is it most marvellous to find such men exclaiming indignantly against those who seek to maintain the full doctrine of their church, as they have sworn to do, neither going beyond it, nor falling short of it, seeking no "non-natural" and "hypothetical" interpretations of plain words to accommodate them to their own views, and who aim, as much as lieth in their power, to restore the decent order and the holy forms of their church, to carry out her rules as they are bound and have undertaken to do, and to defend her against those who deny her doctrines, rebel against her authority, and seek to overthrow

her power. Whilst such things are permitted amongst us, we can have little hope of peace. Private judgment, thus unlimitedly exercised, ever has been and ever will be the fruitful source of heresy and division. Experience has shewn that each man finds some new interpretation, puts forth some new doctrine, which he will maintain to the end, and which another will as positively denounce. There must be some standard, some point wherein all may meet, some definite rule of faith, or the Church of Christ will be multiplied into schisms without end; and one cannot but think it not a little presumptuous that individuals should imagine their own unauthorized teaching to be alone true, in opposition to the learned and the holy of all ages. The English Church allows no such latitude as this; but binds her members to a certain creed, and a certain rule of faith; and common honesty requires that those, who plainly confess that they reject her doctrine, should go from within her pale, at the very least that they should not minister at her altars. Surely this is no hardship, and one cannot exactly understand what wish they can have to remain in a church, whose doctrines they openly proclaim as "soul-destroying."

But there is another cause, the source of all the rest, which is the greatest bar to unity and peace. We can never hope to gain these things to our church, until we divest ourselves of our pride and self-seeking spirit. We must begin with ourselves; for unless the members are holy, the body will not be holy. When we learn greater self-denial, when we reverence the ordinances of our church, when we give ourselves more to prayer and fasting, we may then hope to see better things. Luxury, pride, and self-indulgence, are the crying sins of the

day; carelessness and indulgence are everywhere rife; we must begin with overthrowing these, with becoming lowly in our own eyes, with submitting to authority, with humiliating our own souls, and mortifying and subjecting our own bodies, ere we can reasonably expect amendment. And here I would fain make a few remarks, which though more properly belonging to a moral treatise, may nevertheless find some place here.

Many there are who are scoffers at all religion, and lead reckless lives; many also who are merely careless, who lead apparently good lives, and are frequent in good deeds, and yet cannot properly be called holy, albeit they fancy themselves so, and others give them the same character. But a deed cannot be really good, however excellent in itself, unless proceeding from a good motive, and this is a point generally too little remembered. Men often fancy that if what they have done is good and beneficial, it can matter but little what was the motive. But there are still more, who do not sufficiently scrutinize their motives; who are too soon satisfied and persuaded of their goodness; and who whilst they fondly imagine that they are solely seeking the welfare of others are yet really moved by some subtle latent love of self, so subtle that they know nothing of it, so latent that they could never see it but by the most diligent scrutiny. It is so concealed, that they would start at the bare idea of its existence within them. Too often deeds which seem most charitable even to the doers, spring from, originally, or at least are mixed up with, some feeling of self. Others, again, do not sufficiently understand the motives by which they ought to be actuated. Gratitude to God for His mercies, and a love of Him, are too much forgotten in their account. And yet this love of

God ought to be the mainspring of everything we do; that which is not the fruit of such love to God, however excellent in itself, is unholy. And by a love of God I mean, not a feeling grounded solely on our hope of reward or of our fear of punishment, but a feeling which would lead us to desire to please God, which would make us sorrow at having offended him and broken his laws, even though we were certain that no punishment should follow on our sins, and no reward on our good deeds; a feeling which would make us do right and avoid wrong, solely in order to please Him; such a feeling in fact as we have towards a dear and highly valued earthly parent. This feeling is not to be easily attained, and, we may well fear, exists but little in the present day; by many being unheard and unthought of. Again, repentance is not generally regarded as it should be; men confess their sins and ask for pardon, and fancy this repentance; forgetting that repentance is a long continued act, that their sins should not pass from their mind so soon as pardon is asked, but be ever present to them, putting them on their guard, and making them humble and full of sorrow.

Now this humility, this love of God, this gratitude, and this repentance, are to be attained only by duties, grievously neglected, or else most negligently performed in the present day,—such as prayer and fasting, self-examination and meditation; of these all know the necessity of prayer, yet too many pray carelessly, not with their whole heart and soul, not duly considering what they ask, and to whom they are praying; but as a mere hurried formal duty requiring no preparation beforehand, and to be dismissed from the mind as soon as ended. In like manner the word of God is too frequently read over but

not thought of, not applied, not made the rule of life; no prayer for divine guidance and blessing precedes, no pauses are made to fix the words and apply them, and when the book is closed, it is forgotten until opened again the next day; yet we should "meditate therein day and night." So also the creed is hastily repeated as a form; we profess to believe without considering what that belief is, yet each article of the creed is full of doctrine, full of comfort, and should give us a world of hope, and teach us a world of duties; so the Lord's Prayer. The Holy Eucharist, is observed in like manner; it is true it is approached with awe and reverence; but "do this in remembrance of me" are words often forgotten. We "do this" indeed, but we forget to think of all, of which the duty should remind us; we forget that it is a memorial of the sufferings of Christ, and should lead us to meditate on these, as well as being a channel of blessings to ourselves. Thus is it that even in these great and important matters, we act carelessly and without thought. Self-examination is more thought of than it once was; and if men would rightly pray for assistance, and trace back the deeds of the day, recal and examine carefully all they have done, and said, and thought, enquiring into those things which seem most fair, as well as those which seem most foul, searching into their most inmost motives, and tracing back their sins, they would find the work of repentance more easy, they would see wherein their greatest dangers consisted, and against what they would need to be most on their guard; their return to holiness would be simplified; and their humility increased. Meditation one cannot help fearing is sadly neglected; and yet were it duly practised, how great would be the benefit; would men

seriously set themselves to consider at stated times what God hath done for them, to think over their Saviour's death and sufferings, and their own sins, to think of the power and goodness of their God, to meditate on what they read; and not only this, but to draw lessons from all the occurrences of life, to see His hand in all around them, and to apply things of earth to things of heaven, so that, in a word, God should never be absent from their thoughts; they could not help learning to love Him and desiring to serve and please Him. Infinitely better, yea, infinitely more happy, would this be than to indulge in the idle useless thoughts and schemes, and fancies, which occupy and waste so much of our time. Nor will this unfit us for the society of our fellow men; it will indeed keep us from the haunts of the profane and evil; but the most truly religious man will be ever, not only the happiest in himself, but the most cheerful and most pleasant to all around him. To one other thing I would allude, and that is the curious mixture of motives one sees, the wrong manner of doing what is right; such to wit as Charity-Balls, Charity-Operas, and such like; I say nothing against the amusements themselves, I speak only against the mixture of things which should be kept distinct, of charity and self; a mixture productive of much evil, because men learn to persuade themselves that they are acting charitably, when in real truth, they are often acting selfishly; ostensibly seeking the welfare of others, really seeking their own pleasure; or perhaps partly both. Much better were it that they should shew their humility and self-denial and charity together, by undertaking the collection from house to house of what they need; for mere almsgiving is not charity. Again, how often are

the poor relieved in such a manner as to shew them more keenly their dependence and their degradation, even by those who really feel for them. In fact, not only the motives but the manner of doing things needs to be considered more than it usually is. The English Church has produced truly holy and self-denying men, and why may we not hope that she should do so again? Her sister Church of Scotland has within the last ten years seen the grave close over one of most primitive piety, remarkable as much for his holiness as for his learning, the late Bishop Jolly, of Moray; and she may well hope to see some among her own children in like manner sleep the sleep of righteousness and peace. One most cheering sign has shewn itself of a fresh spring of holiness in the increasing demand for devotional books.—Every day produces some new aid to devotion, breathing a Catholic spirit; and this is no slight criterion of the extent of the improvement; for if such works were not demanded, they would not be thus unceasingly put forth. That our age is not one conspicuous for sanctity cannot be denied; we are still paying the penalty of the last century of sloth, self-indulgence, carelessness, infidelity, and schism, yet there is hope of a richer harvest to be gathered in ere long; and a spirit seems aroused within us destined to shew that the channels of grace are not cut off nor dried up within our church.

I have made these few remarks on some of the evils of the age, and their remedies, partly because I do not think them wholly foreign to the subject which I took in hand, partly because there are many men who love theory better than practice, will eagerly read an argument or controversial work, who would not be allured by a book of devotion, and to whom therefore

these subjects may bring matter for thought, although in themselves no way new. It is idle to imagine ourselves interested in the well being and the prosperity of our church, or to read and fancy ourselves very anxious about the unity and peace of the kingdom of Christ, unless we each do our utmost by our own example, our own humility, our own patience, and our own love to God and zeal in his service, to promote that peace and unity and prosperity. We must first learn holiness ourselves; wherein it really consists and whereby it may be gained. These things if we will but do, we need not fear; sanctity and unity will go hand in hand; and should it be, that evil days are coming upon our church; should her foes gain the mastery over her, and as in the last fearful reign of Puritanism, trample her in the dust,—so far as weak man may be permitted to trample on the daughter of the Most High, and Spouse of the Redeemer,—should grievous and bitter trials be awaiting her, then shall we the better learn to bear them and rejoice; then shall we more nobly abide those fiery trials, and continue faithful to the end; if while we have time we strengthen our souls and confirm our faith, by self-denial in the hour of fulness, by self-mortification in the day of prosperity, and by holiness in the season of earthly temptation and worldly allurements.

Ceasing from our uncharitable and unholy strifes amongst ourselves, we shall be the better enabled to meet the common enemy. We have much to answer for; the disgust occasioned by the disobedient and unruly spirit so rife in our church; the angry clamour against men, many of whom, when it was first raised, sought only the welfare of our church; these things and

such as these have driven from amongst us those, who might have been our noblest defenders, and turned them into fierce and active foes. We may well say, "we are verily guilty concerning our brethren;" for if their own feet may have in some degree erred at first, our strifes and divisions have urged them on still further in search of a home where peace and quietness might be found. They within, and others without, have been driven away, and keep aloof from us by the sight of a discipline openly violated, of doctrines explained away or denied with impunity, whilst their maintainers are reviled; and well may we fear that their blood will be at least required of those, who by thus doing have urged them on to the last fatal step, that step taken in the vain hope that in the church of their choice they will find that unity which they saw and felt was banished from us.—A vain hope indeed is it, for though she may be more careful in concealing her internal strifes, they have raged, nay, they still rage, no less within the Church of Rome than amongst ourselves; as I trust I have already not vainly endeavoured to shew.

We have then duties to ourselves, to our Church, and to the Church Catholic. To the latter; that we should pray for her earnestly that she may be restored to peace and union, and that her dominion and power may be extended; striving ourselves to promote to the utmost such peace, unity, and power, by bringing the heathen to a knowledge of the truth, by removing the veil of darkness spread so thickly before the eyes of the heretics and schismatics, who everywhere abound, and by cleansing of their corruptions and healing of their infirmities, those members of the body, which lie sick and weak and deformed, by reason of the numberless

and afflicting burdens imposed upon them by the Church of Rome.* We owe a duty to our Church; to labour in working out her system, in maintaining her doctrines, in setting forth her beauty to the eyes of all, in healing her strifes and divisions, in praying for her, in keeping aloof from those who rebel against her authority, who insult and revile her, and who seek to dig down her foundations, to raise a building of their own instead. We owe a duty to ourselves, to work out our own salvation, to confirm our faith, to keep at a distance all, who might weaken our allegiance and respect for the spiritual mother that bare us, who might seduce us from her protection to our own destruction, and lead us to stray in unknown paths, against which she has raised a barrier.†

* I would not have it for a moment imagined, that it is to be regarded as a duty to withdraw individual members of the Church of Rome from their allegiance in those lands where the Roman is the faith of the Apostolical Church. This would be to cause schism, and we may not remedy one evil by another. We must labour to convert the church, not the individuals. It is one thing to reform, another and a very grievous one to create a schism under the pretence of reformation.

† Mr. Northcote cannot understand on what principle the schismatics to the Church of Rome should be avoided by their friends. Matters are not as they were once; even granting that it was once allowable to be on terms of intimate friendship with the followers of the Pope, it can be so no longer, since Rome has assumed her present attitude amongst us. But in the first place, the command is express and plain, in no few places of scripture, to avoid schismatics and heretics; in the second, duty and respect to our church, demand that we should avoid those who revile her, *more especially* such as have cast off her authority in rebellion for a new yoke; in the third, the more confident we may feel in our own church, the more does our prudence demand it. We know not our own strength, we may be taken in an unguarded moment of weakness, and our faith may waver. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." It is idle to pray not to be led into temptation and to hope the prayer will be heard, if thus we place ourselves in its very path; we cannot hope to be guarded, but rather to be given over as a prey, if we throw down our own defences. We must avoid those who take the fatal step, and this so much the more the nearer they have been bound to us by ties of friendship or of blood; because then from their greater influence over our minds there is the greater danger. We may not indeed be so much called upon to avoid those who were born and bred up in the corrupt faith of Rome, and who take no active part against our church; but with those, who take such a part or who have left our fold, there is no choice left us: whatever pain it may give to break the ties by which we have been bound, they must be broken. *One thing only* will permit their continuance, viz., if we *hope to be able* to restore the wanderers to our own fold.

These things we must do; and these things if we do diligently, we need have little fear of the result. Let but the doors of the house of God be opened daily, as the Church appoints; let but her Holy Ordinances be duly attended to and reverenced; her communions be less few and far between, and each time thronged more with joyful guests; let her holy days, and seasons, and appointed fasts, be observed in their proper course; and there would be soon but little cause to fear that the spirit of truth and holiness had been taken from us, or that sanctity had ceased to be a note of the English Church. Error in faith, results in sin; blindness to duty, produces blindness to the truth; let us then but seek to be holy; humbly following and trusting to the guidance of our Church; and sanctity will give birth to unity. We should feel less of these attacks, bear less of these taunts and revilings, from the maintainers of the cause of Romish usurpation. Their work of schism in the Christian Church would be brought to an end; their labour of strife and division would be fruitless; their efforts like the barren and accursed fig tree, would wither away. Far better were it that we should attend to our own Church, and be diligent in her service, turning not with "itching ears" to the voice of the stranger and "the charmer, charm he never so wisely;" regarding indeed with all charity and compassion, and pitying love those, who have never known the blessed privilege of membership with the English Church, or who have fallen from "their first estate," "who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come," and who yet have fallen away. Dreadful indeed

is their lot, and well may we tremble for the consequences of their wilful and headstrong sin; for we know that it is written of such, that "it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance." Yet, though it be so difficult, so almost hopeless a task, we nevertheless should be instant in prayer, interceding and "seeking carefully with tears" for the restoration of the lost sheep, the return of the unthankful prodigal; "lifting up holy hands without wrath or doubting;" and beseeching earnestly "the giver of all good gifts" that it may please him "to bring into the way of truth, all such as have erred and are deceived; to strengthen such as do stand, to comfort and help the weak hearted, to raise up those that fall, and finally to beat down Satan under our feet;" to deliver us "from all false doctrine, heresy, and schism;" "that as there is but one body, and one spirit, and one hope of our calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may all henceforth be of one heart and one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Him, who is the head, the spring of life, in whom the whole body is "fitly framed together;" the centre of unity; the fountain of holiness; the light which shineth over all worlds; the source of all power and authority to those who minister in his name; and in whom, and through whom, the whole Church, with every branch thereof, is One, and Holy, and Catholic, and Apostolic.

Printed by W. Pocock, Bridge Street, Bath.